UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES

The Emergency Meeting of the General Faculty
Held on May 20, 2024 at 1:00 p.m. in the Student Union Ballroom

[Please note that due to some issues with the recording instruments in the room that some remarks were unable to be deciphered. This is noted when it occurs.]

Presiding Officer Brewer: Under Section VIII of the Constitution of the University of Massachusetts Amherst Faculty Senate, by a petition of more than 10 % of the faculty, as announced by emailed agenda on May seventeenth, 2024, we are convening an emergency general faculty meeting. Since I believe this is the first general faculty meeting in 15 years, and unfamiliar to all of us, I would like to offer some guidance about how this meeting will be run. I apologize in advance for the length of these remarks.

This is a general meeting of the faculty and librarians of UMass Amherst. All those that hold faculty or librarian rank, including administrators, that are half time or more, may speak and vote. Only those present at this meeting in person, or via Zoom will be allowed to vote.

If the room becomes full, and you are not a voting member, I request that you offer your space to those who are. Please do not ask to be recognized to speak if you do not hold faculty or librarian rank.

Note that although the meeting is being recorded as per usual practice of the Faculty Senate, the purpose of the recording is only to generate a transcript that will be available later on the Faculty Senate website. The recording itself will not be publicly available.

Today, per the published agenda, the Secretary of the Faculty Senate will offer announcements, including the procedures for voting today. The petitioners will offer a 15-minute presentation, followed by a 10-minute Q and A, and then move a single motion that will be on the floor. I will call for a second of the motion, and then let one maker of the motion speak to their motion. Then I will call for further discussion.

In the interests of giving as many people as possible the opportunity to speak, please limit your remarks to no more than 3 minutes. Even at 3 minutes, for all faculty and librarians to speak would require 85 hours. Until everyone who wishes to speak has spoken once, speakers will not be recognized for a second time, so please consider carefully what you would like to do before rising to speak.

We will have participants both on the floor and virtually via zoom. I will recognize participants alternately pro and con on the floor, and pro and con via zoom. When you are recognized to speak, please address your remarks to me as presiding officer. It is out of order to address other people. Please also respect the decorum of the chamber. Boos, clapping, and other audible expressions are out of order, and disruptive behavior will result in a temporary halt to proceedings.

When you are recognized to speak, I recommend you begin your remarks by saying, “I rise to speak for the motion”, or “I rise to speak against the motion”, or, if you would like to offer a motion to say, “I move”.

Before you offer a motion, please have someone at hand to second your motion, as motions without a second are out of order. The most common motions are, “I move to amend”, if you would like to change the wording of the motion on the floor, “I move to substitute”, if you would like to replace a paragraph or the whole motion, or “I move the previous question”, if you would like to request a vote to end debate.

Note that to end debate requires a two-thirds vote of the body. I recommend we not seek to end debate before those who wish to speak have had their 3 minutes. If you want to do something, but are not sure how to do it, please don't be afraid to ask for help. Please say, “Mr. Presiding Officer, I would like to” and try to explain what you want to do. I will try to help you translate what you're trying to do into a motion that the body can consider.

Finally, before we begin. I would like to recognize the work of the Secretary, the Faculty Senate staff, Nathan Lindsay, and the Rules Committee that have done an immense amount of work over the past several days to try to pull this meeting off. Please be patient as we work through any difficulties that may arise.

And with that I would like to call to order this emergency general meeting of the UMass Amherst faculty.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary Paik: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the general faculty meeting, which is created under the Senate Constitution with 24 hours' notice. I would like to thank the Faculty Senate, IT, SACL, as well as the Rules Committee, which has worked very hard to put this meeting together with very little notice in a room we've never used.

So universities and colleges this past academic year, which is annually over, have been in the middle of what we sociologists call a protest wave. And as part of this protest wave we have what is called the diffusion of protest actions, specifically encampments.

These encampments have drawn a number of organizational responses by university administrators across the nation, and since then faculty are weighing and evaluating college and university responses to these encampments and their organizational responses.

For example, Columbia and Emery both sided against censure and voted no confidence in the campus leaders. In contrast, USC, did not approve a no confidence vote, but approved censure. And recently UCLA, using a limited body of the faculty, voted for neither censure nor the support for no confidence.
I would like to note that in our case the issue has been brought to the faculty and librarians at large, as opposed to just the members on Senate, and I think that is a good thing.

Votes of no confidence and censure express disapproval by the faculty. According to Megan Zahneis in a 2022 Chronicle of Higher Education article, she writes, quote "nowhere in the Robert's Rules of Order **[audio unintelligible]** are no confidence votes mentioned." That means that the process in taking up a no confidence vote is largely reinvented each time it happens. I think the last time it happened was in 2007. So it's been a while, and it wasn't from the general faculty. In this case I think we could consider a no confidence vote as a mechanism for expressing dissatisfaction with a person running a university or college.

Censure is mentioned in Robert's Rules, in chapter 20, specifically in a footnote. "A motion of censure can be adopted without formal disciplinary procedures." So while no confidence is symbolic, censure is also an expression for review for specific acts or behavior.

Okay, so on to business. Due to this unique situation, we are unable to take attendance in our typical practice of a sign in sheet at the front door. So if you are a member of the general faculty, that is faculty or librarian half time or more, then I would like you to scan the following QR code and fill out the survey. Please do this only once. That's very important.

If you are a non-member of the general faculty, do not scan the QR code or vote. This is the only time we will take attendance. If people come in late, they will need to contact Caitlyn Foster, the Senate project assistant to register attendance late. I asked the presiding officer to remind those joining late on Zoom that they will need to contact Caitlyn Foster to be verified as eligible to vote. Caitlyn's senate email is projectasst@umass.edu, again Caitlyn's email is projectasst@umass.edu.

As a reminder, we operate under Robert's Rules, so any member can make a point of order if someone near them is being disruptive in their opinion. If necessary, I will make points of order. If the disruptive person is a non-member,

then I will request that the presiding officer remove the disruptive person from the meeting. If the disruptive person is a member, I will ask the presiding officer to issue a warning, and on the second offense, that this be brought to this body to remove that member from the meeting.

As secretary I have a right to speak and vote. However, I be assisting the presiding officer who cannot see the room or hear things that are not near mics. As such I'll be raising issues to him that he will not be aware of by virtue of being remote, and I'll be acting as the teller if we **[audio unintelligible].** As teller I have to represent all sides, which means not weighing in on debate.
Okay, so presiding officer, I request a suspension of the rules.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Without objection, rules are suspended.

Secretary Paik: I would like the general faculty to consider a motion that all motions during the meeting of the general faculty conducted by electronic vote. Ironically, we have to conduct this by voice vote.

[The motion was adopted without objection]

Secretary Paik: So, as I just mentioned, I would like to conduct a secret ballot vote, so please bear with me. This might take a few seconds, because I'm downloading the spreadsheet.

[At this point multiple members on Zoom who were not recognized asked for the QR code to be shown again.]

Secretary Paik: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, secretary, you're recognized to speak.

Secretary Paik: There are individuals who I assume are members that are speaking **[audio cuts out]**

Laurie Salame: Presiding Officer Brewer?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes.

Laurie Salame: So given that only people who register can vote, I think if you're on your phone, you can't use a QR code. Can we drop the actual link into a chat.

Presiding Officer Brewer: QR code is only to register to vote. The questions are going to be sent to you via email to the email that you that you use. And the vote happens via email by Qualtrics. Mr. Secretary, can you present the QR Code again?

Secretary Paik: Sure. Caitlyn, can you present our code once again? We'll need a little time to work on this. So I'm gonna guess that a lot of people will not actually participate in this test vote.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Again for people on Zoom that have been unable to hear what's going on, you use this QR code once, which will register you, and then you should receive via email links to Qualtrics polls, and those will be the items that you vote on.
Presiding Officer Brewer: It is hard to hear things in the room. I've asked Nathan Lindsay, who's running the tech in the room if perhaps the other microphones that are in the room are the ones that are directly to the audio, but the speaker's microphone does not seem to be hooked directly to the audio that we can hear via zoom. And so, I think we're only picking up audio from people that are speaking via the room microphones. I'm gonna trust that Mr. Lindsay is doing his best to try and make the audio work for us.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary, can you provide us with an update on where we are in terms of voting in terms of number of people that have registered and the number of people that have. I've returned the question.

Senator Olsen: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, point of order.
Senator Olsen: Please anyone who is on Zoom. You are not recognized to speak. Turn off your microphones. We do not have that privilege here in the room. You do not have the privilege on Zoom.

Presiding Officer Brewer: If you're on Zoom, you'll need to raise your hand to be recognized to speak, and then I can try and call on people. If you have a point of order, that would be the only reason to ask right now.

Senator Messier: So I think folks are confused, and I just wanna mediate confusion. The QR Code is to register you as an attendee of the meeting.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Correct. And having registered as an attendee of the meeting, you should then receive any questions that are sent out to be voted as an email. And then the email will include a link to a Qualtrics poll that you can respond to. That is my understanding of how the voting system works. Mr. Secretary, would you correct me if I'm mistaken?

Secretary Paik: That is correct. Just give us one second, I haven't sent the Qualtrics yet.

Senator Messier: Thank you

Graduate Assistant Foster: Mr. Presiding Officer, may I be recognized? If you're unable to use the QR code for any reason, please send me an email to register as an attendee of this meeting, and to be able to vote. My email is projectasst@umass.edu, please send me an email if you are unable to use the QR code. If you have already scanned it, you do not need to send me an email. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Just to repeat for everybody on Zoom, if you're unable to scan the QR code, you've been unable to register, send an email to projectasst@umass.edu and then you'll be enrolled manually as an attendee of the meeting. Sindiso MnisiWeeks, do you have a point of order? You are recognized to speak.

Sindiso MnisiWeeks: Okay, thank you. Apologies. I did submit the QR code form, but I have not yet received an email is, should I be writing to Asst?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Projectasst@umass.edu? I do not believe that is necessary. I will ask the secretary in a moment to update us on what the status is.

Secretary Paik: Presiding officer?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, secretary.

Secretary Paik: I am waiting for my software to open up the survey, but it's slow. I'm assuming because of this room. The Wi-Fi is not the greatest. So just some patience, but it's coming, and I'll push out the survey in about one minute.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So the survey will be sent out in one min. So it's no problem if you've not yet received it.

Secretary Paik: **[audio unintelligible]**

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, Mr. Secretary, I'm not sure I can hear you.

Secretary Paik: Thank you for your patience. The email has been delivered to the first batch, but those that are manual adds will probably not get it. So just some patience, and when we actually have our first motion, we will hopefully get that corrected.

Presiding Officer Brewer: For those on zoom, the survey has been sent out. You should be able to vote once you receive it. And they're working on the audio in the room. Sara Mamo, do you have a point of order?

Sara Mamo: Hi, yes, thank you, Mr. Brewer. What are we voting on? I don't understand what's gonna happen when I get this email, maybe because I couldn't hear the opening statements.
Presiding Officer Brewer: Essentially, this represents a test question, about making sure that we can actually make the voting system works. So that's all the first question is.

Sara Mamo: Okay. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Hoang Phan, do you have a point of order?

Hoang Phan: It's more of a question. I did register, but I haven't yet received the email. At what point will I receive this email?

Presiding Officer Brewer: The secretary has sent it out. I'm not sure how long it will take for to be delivered, hopefully soon. Irene Dujovna, do you have a point of order?

Irene Dujovne: Yes, I also haven't received it. So the question is, what's the procedure? And how long should we wait? How do we raise the issue, whether we receive or not the link, and how to proceed.

Presiding Officer Brewer: This is all new to all of us. We're trying to work through this to see if we can find some way to have everyone, both online and in the physical space, be able to vote, and so that's the point of what we're trying to do is to determine how this is going to work.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Professor David Mendekoff, do you have a point of order.

Prof. David Mednicoff: Could you just, sorry, could you just repeat what the address was to send it if the Qualtrics Link didn't work in the first place?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Projectasst@umass.edu

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer?

Deborah Mccutchen: I did receive it. It was in the unfocused portion of Gmail. And it says, 'Please register your vote for motion one. Yes, no abstain'. How do I know what I'm voting on? Sorry you may have answered that.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, I believe the question is just to check whether or not everybody can vote. So it doesn't really matter what you vote, but I hope you'll vote yes. Mr. Secretary, you're recognized.

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer, thank you. There was a slight glitch on the first vote. It was delivered to 195 people, so my apologies, but I will continue working with it. But we should be able to proceed, I think only 195 people received it. I know why, so I'll work on fixing it. I think we can proceed.

Senator Olsen: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order.

Senator Olsen: Vice Chancellor Misra said that it might take up to ten minutes to populate of each vote with Qualtrics. Just so people understand it could be up to ten minutes for each answer.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Mr. Secretary, how would you like to proceed at this point?

Secretary Paik: I believe we can proceed. The test has partially succeeded, but has failed in other ways, but we will be ready for the actual debate.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Do you care to try and repeat the question and have another vote? Or would you prefer to move along with the presentation?

Secretary Paik: I believe we can move along to the presentation.

B. NEW BUSINESS: CONSIDERATION OF A PETITION SUBMITTED BY MORE THAN 10% OF FACULTY AND LIBRARIANS

1. Presentation by Laura Briggs (Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies) and Cedric de Leon (Sociology) (15 minutes)

Laura Briggs: My name's Laura Briggs, I am a faculty member in Women, Gender, and Sexuality studies. I've been chair of in Women, Gender, and Sexuality studies, and well, that was all funny and full of the ridiculousness that Zoom brings us to.

This is a sad day. This is not something I wanted to be doing. What we're here for is to discuss in significant part the events of May seventh, when an encampment was broken up with violence and with significant injuries to students. The aftermath in terms of how the Chancellor responded to that. But of course, this is a story that began on April twenty-ninth, when the first encampment was broken up under threats from the police and, in fact, before that when, in October, when students who were protesting the war were arrested for occupying the Chancellor's office and the aftermath of that.

So on May seventh, the police began amassing at 4:30, and what we heard from Police Chief Parham at the subsequent emergency meeting was the ways in which the police response on May seventh was a response to what protesters were doing. And in the late hours of May seventh and early hours of May eighth. But I wanna suggest that actually, the key decision was made much earlier when a militarized police force was mobilized. And the consequences of that were what followed, or what led to the violent incidents that followed. So at 4:30, the Chancellor began negotiating with protesters, and the goal was to ask them to take down the encampment, which they had agreed to on an earlier date- on April twenty-ninth. However, on this occasion they were prepared for the Chancellor's response, which was a large police contingent, and they declined to take the encampment down.

And I wanna underscore the consequences of these of a militarized police force moving in, not my own words, but in the words of the ACLU of Massachusetts, which said, 'When universities choose to involve police in nonviolent demonstrations, it escalates tensions and creates unacceptable safety risks for all students, faculty, and community members.' Or, similarly, the American Historical Association for me as a historian it's my professional organization, said this 'Historical thinking reminds us that the use of force to suppress peaceful public protest at institutions of higher education endangers students, faculty, and staff.'

This month marks the fifty-fourth anniversary of the killing of students by National Guard troops at Kent State University, and by local and state police at Jackson State. Those terrible events, along with the infamous Orangeburg massacre of 1968 teaches that the introduction of outside armed law enforcement, and even worse military units, escalates tensions rather than leads to constructive resolution of disputes.

So this was the scene on the lawn at 4:30, when the Chancellor and other members of the Administration decided to go in and speak to the protesters. It was, although we might have gotten the impression, if we'd been at the emergency faculty meeting last week that something extraordinary was happening. This is a very typical scene at UMass, and however you feel about protests or Israel/Palestine, we know that this is a routine event on our campus- that groups of protesters gather, they chant, they sing, they beat drums, they hand out leaflets, and that's exactly what was happening at 4:30, when those police officers who were dress uniform were amassing in the Chancellor's parking lot, Lot 71.

The second concern is not just what happened, but the response, subsequently, of the Chancellor- to hearing from us to hearing from the wider community that this was an unprecedented event. I had the opportunity, through graduation, to speak to people who had been part of demonstrations as long as 50 years ago. I was part of an encampment here at mass in the 1980s. To know that the way to use policy is never before been interpreted to say-

Secretary Paik: Point of Inquiry.

Laura Briggs: Yeah.
Secretary Paik: So in this meeting, where you're quoting me, I was reading a list submitted, just to clarify. Can you clarify that, please?

Laura Briggs: Yes, Secretary Paik asked me to clarify why I'm quoting him. This was at the emergency faculty meeting last week, at which the Chancellor was asked "many feel that you've broken their trust. Have you considered apologizing, abstaining from participation in commencement, or even resigning?" And the Chancellor responded in essence, "This was something we had to do."

Now. I just wanna say again, this is not something anybody here has ever experienced before. The police have been called on peaceful protesters-

Secretary Paik: I don't mean to interrupt-

Laura Briggs: Sorry?

Secretary Paik: It would have been great just to clarify that I was reading questions submitted by other people.

Laura Briggs: Yes, I'm sorry. Secretary Paik asks me to clarify that he was reading questions that had been submitted by a larger body.

So it is the concern that we wanna bring forward that an unprecedented interpretation of the land use policy to say that encampments were disallowed when we had encampments last year, we had an encampment in 2011 that went on for many weeks, and that it was also unprecedented to call a militarized police force on peaceful protest streets.

Cedric de Leon: There comes a time in every community's history when its members must reaffirm their identity in the face of power. As faculty, we have no prerogative to fire the Chancellor. But we can hold him responsible for the repression of peaceful protesters, and declare that such violence and brutality has no place at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

At approximately 4:30 on the afternoon of May seventh, 2024, Dr. Reyes sat down with representatives of the protest movement, ostensibly to negotiate. Unbeknownst to the protesters at the table, the Chancellor had already amassed a large police force near the encampment on the south lawn. The daily collegian counted 117 police cars parked at the Whitmore Building that evening. 109 of them state police.

When he did not get what he wanted, which was the unconditional dismantling of the encampment, Chancellor Reyes ordered the arrests of over 130 students, faculty, and community members. By summoning a militarized police force, the Chancellor created an environment in which violence was inevitable. We need only look at the weapons and dress of the police to see the truth in this. Officers wore riot gear complete with helmets, flat vests, and shields, carried rubber bullet guns, and used weapons such as tasers and pepper spray. Surveillance drones circled overhead, and police filmed protesters throughout the day and night.

For numerous nonviolent protesters, the arrest process involved the following: an officer would flash a strobe light in their eyes, temporarily disorienting them while two or three other officers tackled them to the ground, pressed a knee into their back, and Zip-tied their hands before loading them onto shuttles. Once detained in a vehicle or in the Mullins Center, which became a prison that night, protesters remain handcuffed for hours, with no access to bathrooms, tampons, or any other amenities. So brutal was the police assault that one protester suffered a broken leg, while countless others sustained injuries due to prolonged handcuffs. Some community members were taken to the emergency room.

Chancellor Reyes has said that he did what he did for two reasons. The first reason was that the protesters violated the land use policy by setting up their encampment. The second was what he perceived to be in about face from April twenty-ninth when protesters dismantle their tents and May seventh when they refused. But as one Faculty Senator pointed out last week, there is a difference between the violation and enforcement of university policy enforcement. Enforcement is almost always discretionary, and certainly was in this case. Violation of land use hardly

warrents a reaction of such fierce brutality. Several colleges and universities have seen encampments without calling upon the police to forcibly disperse them, including large public universities, such as our own. Indeed, no other UMass Amherst chancellor this century has ordered the violent repression of peaceful protesters, even when they have used similar tactics, such as building occupations and encampments. An overnight student protest encampment just last year did not result in a single arrest.

Nor is our criticism of Chancellor Reyes an isolated opinion. The voice of a vocal minority. The members of ten UMass academic units have condemned the arrests, as have five campus unions and numerous undergraduate clubs. Both GEO and the Student Government Association have already passed votes of no confidence. Beyond campus, Chancellor Reyes has caused reputational harm to the University drawing criticism from the Massachusetts ACLU, US. Congressman Jim McGovern, and the Pulitzer Prize-winning author, Colson Whitehead, who withdrew from being this year's commencement speaker. Whitehead said “Calling the cops on peaceful protesters is a shameful act.”

Now some might say that we must go slower. That we need more factors. And that a committee or consulting firm should be able to conduct a full-scale investigation before we take any action against the Chancellor. But we do not suffer from a lack of other information. Since May seventh we have been inundated with emails, newspaper articles, television footage, and social media posts. The May fourteenth Faculty Senate meeting was standing room only in the largest classroom on campus. The Chancellor and the faculty had a direct exchange for two hours. This is not a factual dispute, but a disagreement over our identity as a university. On October twenty-fifth and May seventh, Chancellor Reyes told us who he really is-

Presiding Officer Brewer: Note that you're at your 15 minutes. You may continue, but please wrap up promptly.

Cedric de Leon: It is our duty to listen as the faculty of this great university. it falls upon us to restore the trust that has been broken. Chancellor Reyes is out of touch with the norms and values of this community, especially our history of protest and our commitment to social justice. We cannot permit what happened on May seventh to ever happen again, and so we must hold to account the person responsible for the violence and repression of that day; by declaring to the Administration and each other that we have no confidence in the leadership of Chancellor Reyes. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: We now have a 10 minutesperiod available for people that have questions. If you have questions for the speakers, you may come to one of the two microphones, or on zoom, and I will try and recognize people alternately. I cannot see very well both of the microphones, so it's hard for me to tell who's in line, but it looks to me like we have microphones on from the back of the room on the left side and the east, or the right side and the left side. So I'm gonna call for a speaker at the left microphone. First, you're recognized to speak.

Secretary Paik: Point of order, Presiding Officer.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, Secretary.

Secretary Paik: There was a quite bit of applause. And I just would like you to remind people that currently we are through the rules of decorum, and that people should conduct themselves with Rogers Rules.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, audible expression **[audio distortion],** So that includes applause or booze or snapping or any other audible expressions. Please be recognized to speak, and then you may speak. So you're recognized at the left microphone.

Cedric de Leon: Excuse me, Mr. Presiding officer, the presenters have a one-minute video they would like to show. May we please show that video? And also, we have not yet actually made the motion.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Right, this is a question-and-answer period. That was to take place for ten minutes, according to the agenda. But I would like to go ahead and move on with the question-and-answer period as we're already at nearly an hour into this meeting. And so I would like us to move ahead with questions, and then we will have the motion. So at my the microphone to the left you're recognized to speak.

Sophia Alf Hasan: In the past couple of days, I've heard faculty members say that the Chancellor's action has created an unsafe environment on this campus. However, as a black faculty member and black students, the not feeling safe has been here for years. The Chancellor's action did not create our feelings on our state of not being safe on this campus. It's important for us to meet with the Chancellor and the Administration to have dialogue to discuss when, how, and when you want to police. Getting rid of the Chancellor is not gonna fix our issue of not being safe. He didn't create this. He didn't create this! The question I have for the petitioners, all the individuals that signed petitions on this, prior to the instance that happened on this campus, police have been called on black students numerous times. What actions did you guys take to work with administration to fix those to make people look like me feel safe on this campus.

Cedric de Leon: Thank you so much for that question. I completely sympathize with you. I think that the level of anti-black racism, both on this campus and in society at large, is absolutely out of control. And so what I would want to say is that absolutely it was our responsibility and duty.

Sophia Alf Hasan: But you did nothing! But now you're taking action?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Excuse me, excuse me, you're not recognized.

Cedric de Leon: We don't know each other and that's okay. But I have been I- I was involved in movement for black lives in 2020, and I was in the streets as well. So I participated in the rebellion of that summer. It is not the case that I did nothing. Now I am Filipino, but I see myself very much in solidarity with black people in this country. And so I think that it is- I think that you are right to decry anti-black racism on this campus. I think it has been unsafe for black people. And we need to do more about that. And sister if you want me to be out on the lines with you, in the fight with you, I would be there with you, standing shoulder to shoulder.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I'm now going to go to Zoom. Leili Shahriyari, you're recognized to speak, to ask a question.

Leili Shahriyari: Thanks. I just wanna ask if the motion is approved, what will happen next?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Did you hear the question, presenters?

Cedric de Leon: So the question is, if the motion is approved, then what happens next? Laura, do you want to?

Laura Briggs: I can. I can speak to that, sure. If the vote against Chancellor Reyes **[audio incomprehensible]** to decide what he wants to do in a context where undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty have all expressed, and a lack of confidence in his leadership. I think it will also be up to the Board of trustees and the President of the system, and our elected leaders.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Microphone right, you're recognized to speak.

Senator Gordon: Mr. Presiding Officer and members of faculty. I am Daniel Gordon, a professor of history, and I rise to ask a question. It was just a few days ago that I told some colleagues in my department that I would not be speaking at this meeting. The reason was that I didn't feel like I had enough reliable information to make a decision about a vote of no confidence.

However, over the weekend, I came to feel that this lack of information is precisely the reason why I should at least ask a question. And the basic question which was addressed. But I think it was addressed to cursorily in the presentation is, why are we moving so fast? As a historian and as an author of a book entitled *What Is Academic Freedom?* I have learned that when a referendum is taken by an entire university faculty, the faculty usually receives two memos in advance, one in support of the resolution and one against. We don't have anything like that here. We don't have a written report of any kind. So I ask, why are we moving so fast?

We have received, in fact, conflicting reports. We have heard that police use tasers and batons, and that they do not use tasers and batons. Some of us have heard that a Jewish student was physically assaulted by a protester which was not mentioned in the presentation. I myself have received emails stating that some protesters hauled in pallets,

and that these were being screwed together into a pen with the last panel bolted into place, so that no one would be able to get in or out. If there were an emergency like a fire, that would be indeed a very dangerous situation. But I remain unsure if that is true or not, but nevertheless, it leads me to ask, why are we moving so fast? The proposed resolution does not accuse the Chancellor of engaging in any illegal acts. Rather he faced a situation in which others appear to be acting unlawfully. There are some questions about whether he made a proper judgment to bring in the police, but why must we make a judgment about this judgment? Now, what exactly, is the emergency? As academics, we often take months or years before we report the findings of our research-

Presiding Officer Brewer: That's three minutes. Would you please wrap up?

Senator Gordon: Thank you. My question is, of course, why must we do this now?

Cedric de Leon: This is why we should do it now. **[A video is played by the presenters]**

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer? Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary Paik: Can you make a ruling as to the question-and-answer session? Questions that are posed to the presenters are shown a video in response. I believe you should answer verbally.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So we have reached the conclusion of the question and answer period, the ten minutes are up, so I believe it's time for us to read the motion and move along. So I call on the lead petitioner to read the motion.

Laura Briggs: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I move that whereas, Chancellor Reyes created an unsafe environment at UMass Amherst by summoning a militarized police force to our campus on May 7; and whereas, Chancellor Reyes's response to the events of May 7 betrayed core values of our UMass community; and whereas, Chancellor Reyes, in every forum since May 7, has refused responsibility for the harm done to our community; and whereas, the undergraduate and graduate student communities have already passed resolutions of no confidence in Chancellor Reyes; be it resolved, that the faculty and librarians of UMass Amherst vote no confidence in Chancellor Reyes.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Do you have a second for your motion?

Senator Katz: Point of information.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, you're recognized.

Senator Katz: You use the phrase, no confidence. No confidence is not defined in our bylaws, in our constitution, or in Robert rules of order. So I would just like you to define what you mean by no confidence. But you mean that the chamber should be removed from office? You mean he should resign? And can you please contrast censor versus no confidence. Again, it's not defined in the bylaws.

Laura Briggs: We have as the faculty no power to remove or retain Chancellor Reyes. It is an expression of an opinion. It is our opinion that we no longer have confidence in the Chancellor. I will say that I was quite struck by the fact that within 48 hours of posting a petition for a no confidence vote 25% of the faculty signed it in two days.

Senator Katz: But again, what is the definition of no confidence?

Laura Briggs: I think of it as a self-explanatory phrase. It really is an opinion. We opine that the ways that the Chancellor has governed this community, the ways that this chancellor has treated our students, sent our students from a protest, a peaceful protest to the hospital in an ambulance, that we no longer feel that that he can act to represent us

Senator Katz: So you're basically in effect saying, you can **[audio distortion]**

Presiding Officer Brewer: Neil Katz, you're no longer recognized to speak. You've had your point of quarter. You've asked your question. It's been responded to.

So the motion has been made and seconded. Would the maker of the motion, like to speak to their motion?

Unidentified Speaker: I have a question, point of order. Can I ask it, or does it take my time for…

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order, there's a question.

Unidentified Speaker: There is a different motion. Is that now, or is that after we begin discussion on the first motion, not the second?

Presiding Officer Brewer: So the motion has been made. It's been seconded. Now the maker of the motion has the right to speak to the motion briefly, and then I will ask if there's further discussion, and then we will develop a speaking order. My plan is to have people that speak for the motion to stand at the left microphone. People that wish to speak against the motion to stand at the right microphone. I will call alternately between pro and con in the room, and then pro and con via zoom, and we'll have discussion. I will limit conversation. I will limit questions or statements to three minutes, or at least at three minutes I will notify you that you've reached three minutes and ask people to wrap up and we will move on that way.

So does the maker of the motion care to speak to the motion?

Laura Briggs: We wish to begin the discussion. As many people know we've had plenty of time to speak.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Very good. So if you would like to speak against the motion, I would like you to line up on the left hand side, if you'd like to speak for the motion, I'd like you to line up on the right hand side. And we will begin with someone speaking for the motion from the right-hand side.

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer? Who's left and who's right?

Presiding Officer Brewer: I messed that up. I've now made a note so that I'll remember if you'd like to speak for the motion stand then, on the right hand side, if you'd like to speak against the motion, stand on the left hand side, and then I will try and alternate that way. So let's begin with someone speaking for the motion on the right hand side.

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer, point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, secretary.

Secretary Paik: Can you please instruct the speaker to address you, the presiding officer, not the audience?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, when you're when you make remarks, you're addressing me, the presiding officer. And then I will recognize people accordingly.

Presiding Officer Brewer: You're recognized to speak.

Diana Sierra Becerra: I teach Latin American history and gender history, and I wanna speak to the impacts of the Chancellor's actions on women and people of color on this campus. This past academic year the Chancellor has had the discretion to deescalate and negotiate directly with our students. He has refused. As a reminder, students of color are the leaders in organizations like UMass The Centers, Students for Justice in Palestine, the Prison Abolition Collective, which has been organizing against police violence for many years, and the GEO Palestine Solidarity Caucus.

Instead of deescalating, the Chancellor has called the police twice in response to student protests. Last October, and most recently in May. At our last Faculty Senate, I was appalled that he did not even reflect on his actions, let alone show empathy for our injured students. When someone shows you repeatedly who they are, believe them.

My History Department, in addition to the Center for Latin American Studies program, has denounced the Chancellor's actions to call the police. The Chancellor has made my job as a woman of color more difficult. I cannot do the job of welcoming people of color, especially women of color, onto this campus.

He is hurting our national international reputations. Two speakers from the 2018 Feinberg Lecture Series, who are from El Salvador, have expressed their disgust with the Chancellor's actions. Colton Whitehead has refused to be our commencement speaker. Our university is currently under Federal investigation for racism against Arab students, Palestinians, and Muslim students. I have met personally with two Arab young women who got a court order restraining order against a white male student who sexually harasses them. The courts were faster than UMass at taking their safety concerns seriously. My colleague, Rachel Weber, is a Jewish woman and attorney representing the arrested faculty and students, she teaches in Stepek, she has received hundreds of death and rape threats for her support of protesting students. A chancellor who does not take rape threats seriously does not deserve to be in leadership.

Academic sanctions, in addition to the legal charges, have negatively impacted the health and the academic focus of our students, and that burden falls disproportionately on students of color. Students of color are fearful for their safety, for their international visas. In my last day of class we spent it sobbing, recounting police violence. And some people are concerned about the optics of openly criticizing a Latino Chancellor. I refuse to let the Chancellor weaponize his identity to avoid accountability from inflicting state violence against our students. Practicing anti racism means holding people of power accountable. And as an immigrant woman of color I have zero confidence in Chancellor Reyes, and by voting no confidence I think we begin to repair the harm that the Chancellor has caused.

Presiding Officer Brewer: You've reached three minutes.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I'd like to now recognize someone at the left-hand side.

Senator Bertone-Johnson: I wanna echo a lot of the comments that were made by Professor Gordon. Over the last few weeks, I've read many accounts of the events of May seventh, and many of these I found directly in contradiction to one another. For example, I've read widely that the police were in battle dress, but more recently seen that much of a protective gear was dawned after they found piles of rocks found at the encampment intended to defend the encampment.

I've also heard many inconsistencies in the timeline of different parts of the actions and given the vast amount of inconsistent information being disseminated and a lot of it which is clearly very emotional and feels like it's intended to provoke an emotional response, I feel like an independent investigation is clearly needed.

I am a scientist. I teach my students the importance of gathering data systematically and objectively and analyzing it without bias or preconception before reaching into conclusions. I am concerned that what we're being asked to do today is not setting a good example for students and is not a responsible way to encourage students to process data in that we are asking faculty to reach a conclusion and pass judgment in the absence of an objective investigation to determine what actually happened..

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. I'm now gonna go to zoom. So I noticed that we have a speaking order of people that have raised their hands in zoom. What I'm going to ask you to do now is to use an emoji to indicate, or a reaction, to put either a thumbs up or thumbs down if you are for or against the motion, and I'm going to try and choose someone at the top of the speaking order, who speaks for. Isabel Espinal, you're recognized to speak.

Isabel Espinal: Thank you. I rise to speak for the motion. I have been a librarian at UMass, and lived in Amherst since 1998. Heads up that I am speaking from the Dominican Republic right now, and I might lose power at any time, so bear with me if that happens. The past almost two weeks have been really hard at this university, and in Amherst more generally. Employees, students, alum, and community members have been deeply upset about the calling in of police for a peaceful gathering and demonstration, for the size of the police presence and for their violence against our community. I was at the encampment, and it was the most thoughtful and inclusive and educational protest action I have seen in my 26 years here. So many of us were very proud of our students, and faculty and staff colleagues, and of the local Amherst community that came out in support and solidarity. These beloved members of our community, the students especially, should be celebrated, not treated the way they were.

We were gathering in peace and speaking up for peace, speaking up to stop a genocide happening right now in our lifetime. The evening of May seventh, I left the encampment to attend a dinner for a faculty job applicant for the center for Latin American, Caribbean, and Latin X studies. While at that dinner I received a text that other faculty who had stayed at the encampment with me had been arrested. And then other arrests came.

I know a lot of people at UMass and in the surrounding community. The day after the arrest, multiple faculty, staff, and community members came up to me, wrote to me, or expressed themselves in group settings, letting me know how deeply shaken and outraged they were, and some could barely find the words. I was part of a group of faculty, staff, and librarians who went to meet with Chancellor Javier Reyes the morning after the police brutality, Wednesday morning, May eighth. We went in with grave concern and with suggestions for how to make repair.

When I was at the Faculty Senate meeting on Tuesday, May fourteenth, I saw absolutely no evidence that he heard us, or understood the deep wounds that were inflicted across the campus and our local communities by this police force, by calling in the police. When asked to support a vote of no confidence, I hesitated. I wasn't ready to do that. I had multiple conversations in order to reach a conclusion, and I reviewed a lot of what had been happening this year. I really wanted to think this through, as some have suggested today. I realized, after careful consideration, that all the students and faculty who have been having numerous conversations with him since October to change course on the carceral approach to peaceful protest had already given him multiple chances to engage compassionately.

Because of my cultural affinity, even the language affinity, on multiple occasions I had spoken to the Chancellor in Spanish, which has been such a rare experience for me to speak in Spanish with any UMass Administrator. I felt an access and connection with this Chancellor that I had never felt in 26 years. But it broke my heart to see these events unfold. Heartbroken, I am supporting this vote. The meeting on Tuesday, May fourteenth, clarified for me that this is the right path. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you, Isabel. Please, if you're on zoom, and you would like to speak, use a down thumb emoji, and I will choose whoever's in the speaking order. I believe I saw Daryl Ramsey Musolf, and so I'm gonna ask him to go next. You're recognized to speak, Darryl.

Darrel Ramsey Musolf: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I rise to speak against the motion with the people, bringing the motion, which is Briggs, de Leon and my colleagues. I hear your anger, your disillusionment, and your contempt for the Chancellor and his actions.

But what I do not hear is any information or any words about the accountability of the protesters themselves. The key thing that the Chancellor has been saying is that you have the right to protest. You can protest. But it was clear that the students decided not to take down the tents. And for us to rush through this motion of no confidence without looking at both sides or multiple sides of this situation, I feel, is a travesty.

So what I would like to close with is we're speaking about the things that happened on campus. But what we're not talking about are the people in Palestine, the hostages that are Israeli, Netanyahu and his war machine, Hamas and their war machine, and ultimately a two-state solution. Again, I rise to speak against this motion of no confidence. Thank you, Presiding officer.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you, Darryl. We're now going to return to the room, and I'm going to ask for someone on the right-hand side at the microphone to speak for the motion.

Christian Appy: Thank you. Presiding an officer. I'm Director of the Ellsberg Initiative for Peace and Democracy. I was one of the faculty members arrested on May seventh. We were first arrested, and we were treated with reasonable restraint. However, there were numerous instances of excessive force by the police against our students. One of my own graduate students was thrown to the ground, face down, with a knee pressed so hard in his back that he struggled to breathe. He was Zip-cuffed so tight that his hands immediately began to swell. He was put in the back of a small window-less police van, and made to sit there for several hours before he was transported to the Mullin's Center to join many other arrested students.

His experience was not exceptional. Some arrestees were subjected to greater violence. At the arena, many were out all night, still zip-cuffed, denied food or water, and were not allowed to go to the bathroom except after hours of pleading, if at all.

I did a lot of soul searching that afternoon before the arrest to decide what I would do, and in the end it was an easy decision, because I simply asked myself, what would Daniel Ellsberg do as me? You'll remember that in 1971, Ellsberg gave to the present people the Pentagon papers, 7000-page classified history of the Vietnam War that exposed decades of government lies about the causes and conduct of that war. When he was arraigned, he was asked by someone if he was worried. He turned and said, 'wouldn't you go to prison to help end this war?'

In the past few years, up until this year, I've never been prouder to be a member of this university. In 2019 we acquired Daniel Ellsberg's papers, administration funded a number of ambitious projects to build on his legacy, and in early 2023 we were the only university ever to grant and award an honorary degree to Ellsberg. That's one of the reasons I was so shocked and grieved by the Chancellor's decision to crack down on peaceful antiwar protesters on campus. It was a betrayal not only of Ellsberg's example, but of the University's own bold motto, be revolutionary. There was no threat to campus safety from the encampment. Safety was only threatened when the Chancellor ordered state, local, and campus police to make mass arrests. Nor were there good faith negotiations in advance of arrests. Nor were the arrests an absolute last resort. Daniel Ellsberg died last June, so we can't know the certainty what his response would be to my question. But I did write his widow Patricia to tell her of my arrest. And-

Presiding Officer Brewer: Your three minutes are up and so please conclude promptly.

Christian Appy: She made **[audio indecipherable]**. 'I'm sure Dan would advise you to get arrested. In some ways, I'm glad he's no longer here, because he would have been **[audio indecipherable]** at some of the horror perpetrated by Israel on Gaza, and probably arrested many times in protests.' He often said, courage is courageous. It should not take much courage for us to stand up together in defense of the right to assemble peacefully and to speak freely. Please join me in a vote of no confidence.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Speaker on the left to speak against, you're recognized to speak.

Ray La Raja: I rise to speak against the motion. Mr. Presiding Officer, based on what I know so far, I disagree with how the Chancellor handle the situation. However, this is a premature vote of no confidence. Many of us faculty and librarians don't have enough information. More critically, we have not had time to deliberate on the information that we have.

Think about it. There's a rush to turn in grades, make end of year decision, say goodbye to our students, and events are still fresh information still catchy, and passions are high. Research tells us these factors are about the worst time to make a decision. No one can deny. This has been a very challenging situation for the Chancellor, a situation which has vexed the most experienced academic leaders in the country. The Chancellor has been here less than a year, and learning how to engage with the local community and culture.

Our previous Chancellor Swammy said he did not make any big decisions in his first year while he was absorbing the new experience. He was lucky not to have this situation thrust upon in that year. We are here to hold campus leaders accountable, especially for upholding rights of free speech. In doing this we cannot ignore important values that go with free speech at a university: reason and deliberation. We take the time to look at evidence and deliberate. It seems unacademic to rush to the decision. So I oppose a vote of no confidence at this moment. I recommend that group of faculty and my brains, possibly an independent group, investigate the situation during the summer, and issue a report in mid-August, and possibly reconvene for a vote in early September. Importantly, this report will also lay the groundwork for how we would like the University leadership to handle situations like this in the future, and it could not come at a better time with high-stakes elections in November, which has the potential to cause many campus protests. We owe it to our students to demonstrate our free speech. We owe it to them to show how we deliberate over evidence rather than rush to a decision. We owe it to ourselves and to this university.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you very much. I'm not going to go to zoom for someone who would like to speak for the motion. Please use a reaction to do a thumbs up, and I'll look for the most recent person. Fareen Parvez, you are recognized to speak.

Fareen Parvez: Great, thank you. Nothing makes me more anxious than talking about this intersection of free speech and Palestine, which has everything to do with racism and violence, which many of us know very intimately, and I venture to say, especially our black students, faculty, and staff. It's hard to articulate what it does to you when you've been accused so many times and in so many ways of being a terrorist, because you advocate for the equal human rights of Palestinians. Accused of being antisemitic, which for me has been the most offensive and hurtful accusation in my life, because it is such a vile form of hate and racism that I reject with all my being. But as anxious as this makes me, I have to speak now, because this moment demands that we take a stand and do the right thing.

I am voting for this motion, although I believe that what's at stake is much larger than any individual or the mistakes and judgment errors of one person. But this is about leadership and our values as a community. I was devastated that UMass join the ranks of the institutions that would rather unleash violence against their students than allow them to express their opposition to a war that has brought on one of the worst humanitarian crises of our lifetimes, one that has killed mostly women and children. In addition to seeing images of children in Gaza every day bleeding from their heads and missing their limbs, we are also seeing images of police all over our country in a rage, beating peaceful and passionate protesters, students, even young teenagers, in a few cases causing near lethal injuries, as just happened two days ago in New York City. And what I find just as disturbing is that thousands of people in real life and on social media are cheering on this police brutality, including what happened on our campus.

How do we process the fact that there are people giving a thumbs up to police throwing our UMass and Five College students onto the ground. Is this the culture that we want our leadership to be inadvertently promoting or aligning itself with? I don't think so. For me, this is about the sanctioning of a culture of violence and dehumanization. Palestinians, of course, but now, even of our very own students. It's about the abuse of power and the spread of misinformation about what protesters are actually doing, and the absence of remorse or repair from our leadership. And we cannot allow this to happen again.

As I wrote in a recent OP. Ed in Mass Live even before the mass arrests of May seventh, it was a shame that the Administration forced students to remove their tents after barely 24 hours. I spent time at encampments in Amherst, in New York and Boston, and here's what I saw at all of them: students of all backgrounds, collectively grieving together, expressing their disillusion, practicing solidarity, and experimenting with making a different kind of world. A world that neither Chancellor Reyes generation, nor my generation was able to give them, prefiguring the world they wanna live in, trying out inclusive ways of organizing and daily life, sharing skills from medicinal to artistic building, an economy of care, based on mutual aid, and learning from mistakes are all themes shared across these encampments, including UMass. Creative experimenting toward a better world is the widest vision of what higher education can offer. And this is exactly what it means to be revolutionary. I say this as someone who has taught theories of revolution. So in the name of our values, of inclusion and integrity, in the name of our students, who deserved to be treated with respect and care and nonviolence, I have to follow my conscience and vote yes on this motion. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Again, via zoom, if you wish to be recognized to speak against the motion, please use a thumbs down. Jonathan Skolnick, you're recognized.

Jonathan Skolnik: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I would like to speak against the motion. I wanna echo the sentiments of colleagues that that we don't have enough information about the events of May seventh. Were tasers used? Were they not used? What is the timeline of the assault on an undergraduate student before police came in? I echo the calls of colleagues for a substitute motion that would call for an outside independent panel of inquiry to review, and I echo the sentiments of the colleague who said that this is very important to do in this moment. We're establishing best practices, practices for the tumultuous times we live in, and perhaps I fear the even more tumultuous times to come. It is really of the moment. This is not something we should rush into.

Additionally, I would like to, you know, speak against the idea that this was an entirely peaceful demonstration. It's my understanding that a Jewish student was physically assaulted, an undergraduate student, physically assaulted on our own campus before police arrived, for using the public spaces, as is there right, like this is the protesters right to use the public space in appropriate ways. And I also want to direct colleagues to a change.org a petition from 272 Jewish students and community members thanking the Chancellor for their support, speaking to actually multiple physical assaults on our undergraduate Jewish students this year, and to their experiences on campus that, I think, have not been spoken to, and I also, would like to lament the lack of solidarity.

If we had seen physical assaults on undergraduate students from any other group on campus, any other minority group, we would see a massive outpouring of solidarity from faculty. I would be there. I have been there when hate speech was scrawled on a student's dorm. I think we need to recognize and to have an honest conversation about the character of some of the things that went on with the protest and to have accountability. But most importantly, I think we need to proceed judiciously, and to have an independent panel. Review the actions and establishe best practices, and if I have remaining time, I yield it, please.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you very much. We're now going to return to the room, and if someone recognized on the right-hand side who would like to speak for the motion.

Joseph Levine: I've been on this campus for 18 years, and I rise to support the motion. I wanna speak to this question of the fears of Jewish students on campus. As a Jew myself, who grew up in an orthodox household and have been in a Jewish atmosphere my entire upbringing, I've lived in Israel, I'm very aware of what antisemitism looks like. So when I saw those people marching in Charlottesville a few years ago, with Tiki torches and yelling, 'Jews will not replace us', yes, that that struck fear into my heart. However, I spent time with the students in this encampment. Given lectures to them actually on the history of Jewish dissidents against Zionism, and the complicated character of the Jewish experience and its relation to Zionism. I met many of the students who there that were Jewish. The idea that there was in any sense a spirit of Jew hatred or antisemitism in that and that space was just absurd. What I saw were people who cared about others, who wanted equality, who wanted to engage. And also, this is a shout out to Hillary Clinton, and people who knew what they were talking about. I don't know if people heard Clinton say they don't know the history. They did know the history. They knew a lot, and they were learning, and they were eager to learn. I saw no cases of any counter protester who was in any way assaulted.

Now I do wanna say there was one incident, supposedly, that happened late on Tuesday. I don't know all the details, but it's very marking, and it looks like it might have been someone who was provoking others. But at any rate, I do wanna also speak to the important distinction between discomfort and unsafety. Many people grow up with certain ideas that they're invested in that have become crucial to their identity, and then when they get challenged, I understand that's very uncomfortable. And that is an experience that happens in college for all sorts of people, on all sorts of issues. And yes, I can imagine discomfort if you hear people chanting various things. But that is not unsafety. If you're talking about unsafety, at least at the level that requires a response from the police, then you need some genuine objective standard, not just what people say they feel. And as far as I can tell, I've seen, and nobody I know has seen, any real credible evidence that there was any sort of safety issue that could possibly have warranted a police presence, and much less a hundred and seventeen cars. Thank you.

Laura Briggs: Point of parliamentary information.

Presiding Officer Brewer: You're recognized to speak.

Laura Briggs: In regards to our previous speaker, who mentioned a petition with 272 names. That is a change.org petition that was available to anybody nationwide who wanted to sign it. I went in and checked, and first you can't see who the people are who signed it, but you can see those who leave a reason why they signed. I checked the first twenty names of them, thirteen as far as I can tell-

[Interruption by unrecognized member]

Secretary Paik: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: As this person to speak has a point of order, please come to your point.

Laura Briggs: The point is that the petition is fake. It is not from our community s-

Secretary Paik: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Secretary. Mr. Secretary, you recognize to speak.

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer, I think this is more a commentary as opposed to-

Laura Briggs: Well, it's a factual point. We explained that these were people from our community, andt hirteen of them have no association, or were decades old associations and only twenty two were actually current students.

Presiding Officer Brewer: If you wish to speak, you may move into line. But right now we're having people speak for and against, and we're not challenging the things that people are saying. We're now on to have somebody who's speaking against the motion on the left hand side. You're recognized to speak.

Lisa Fontes: Those who put forth this motion are acting as if this is a vote on police brutality. I think we can say with confidence that everybody in this room would vote against police brutality. This is not a vote against police brutality. This is also not a vote on the Middle East. This is a vote against the first and only Latino chancellor on this UMass campus, and as maybe on any UMass campus, I'm not sure.

He walked into a mess this year when he walked into the job. You know that, and I know that, and leaders across the country have struggled with this mightily. I do not believe that pushing out Chancellor Reyes will solve the problem of police brutality in this state, and it certainly will not tell us how to act in the future in terms of when and how to call the police or other systems to manage difficult situations, and how we vote today will not create peace in the Middle East.

My colleagues would have us believe that Chancellor Reyes is personally responsible for the tight zip-ties, for the lack of access to the bathroom of arrested people, for police using helmets, maybe using tasers, I don't know that hasn't been confirmed or disconfirmed yet, he is not it. It seems to me that we should be giving Chancellor Reyes a chance. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you very much. And we will now go to Zoom. And so those who are online in Zoom, if you would use an up arrow, an up thumb, to indicate that you would like to speak. Is there anyone that wishes to speak for the motion on Zoom? Laura Quilter. you're recognized to speak.

Laura Quilter: Thank you. I rise in support of the motion to vote no confidence in Chancellor Reyes. I wish to respond to the concerns of my colleagues regarding academic freedom and an academic process. This vote is, in fact, about process. It is about the process of dealing with the dissent, disagreement, protest, education that are inherent and essential to a university. The question is whether that process is handled by police or by good faith negotiation and deliberation, education and dialogue.

My colleagues have urged delay, citing reason, deliberation, scholarship, academic virtues. Indeed, that is the very problem that we are dealing with. Chancellor Reyes has failed to demonstrate reason, deliberation, and academic virtues in these disputes. Instead, he responded with force.

Ought we delay for fact-finding? There are indeed times that fact finding is appropriate. We can certainly do fact finding and get a comprehensive report. Very possibly we will find error or problematic behavior from individuals. This will not affect the undisputed characterization of the overall encampment as a classic, peaceful protest. The question before us is simple. Further fact-finding will not further illuminate this question. Do we believe that overwhelming police force and arrests are the appropriate way to respond to a protest? Can overwhelming police force deescalate, bring peace, calm, dialogue, education to a protest? Who is responsible for the overwhelming police force? Chancellor Reyes. I do not believe that overwhelming police force is appropriate in an academic setting, in a university setting, and that is why I rise in support of this motion to vote no confidence in Chancellor Reyes.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you, Laura. And I believe I saw that Laurie Salame would like to speak against the motion, so I will recognize her. You're recognized to speak.

Laurie Salame: Thank you. I just feel the motion is premature. I wanna know more information, specifically if Marty Meehan and or the Board of Trustees were in any way, shape, or form involved in this decision making. If they said, ‘Hey, Javier, get these kids off my lawn’, I would want to know that, because then we could have a more impactful motion that would include our vote of no confidence against one, two, or three of these bodies, not just singling out one person who may have been involved in the decision. I yield the rest of my time.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. And so now we will return to the room. let's see, I see people standing for to speak for the motion. Is there someone standing speak against the motion? I think there is. Alright. So we'll recognize someone to speak for the motion that's on the right hand side. You're recognized to speak.

Sigrid Schmalzer: Thank you, Presiding Officer. I was one of the four faculty arrested on May seventh. As an MSP Officer, I've also met regularly with the Chancellor this year. I should note that today I am not speaking for the MSP. I am speaking as a faculty member with knowledge based on my service in MSP. We've been hearing a lot arguing that the No Confidence vote is premature, alleging there's not been time since May seventh to judge the Chancellor's actions. I wanna make clear that this is not just about May seventh.

For a full academic year, we have witnessed the leadership failures that made what happened on May seventh utterly predictable. The Chancellor has claimed that calling in the police to crush the student protest was a last resort, and that he had no choice. This is patently false. In fact, he had the power to lead us down a very different path. At each step, beginning with his decision on October twenty-fifth not to meet with the students occupying Whitmore before arresting them for trespassing, he has chosen to avoid acting as a positive leader.

MSP officers have repeatedly urged the Chancellor in private meetings and in the Faculty Senate to reduce the overly punitive sanctions on those students. He met our recent arguments with nonsensical claims that he had no authority to intervene. He referred repeatedly to non-existent processes, even when we read aloud to him the actual language in the code of student conduct. This was embarrassing for many of us as academics. And he used these imaginary processes to absolve himself of any responsibility, passing the buck to less powerful administrators.

Given this pattern of evasion and prevarication, it was no wonder that on May seventh, while police in riot gear were already assembling, students were unable to trust his vague assurances. He had refused to intervene for 6 months, and built no lines of communication with student leaders that would have allowed meaningful dialogue. Prior to the evening of May seventh, the Chancellor had a great deal of power to lead in a way that would have resulted in a better outcome. But once he called in the riot police there really was no other way things were likely to unfold.

I was lucky to be one of the first arrested before people began to be badly hurt. The scariest part for me was how wound up the officer who arrested me was. He pulled the zip ties around my wrist so tightly I was afraid there was gonna be permanent damage. Still more frightening, I could feel the officer shaking as he led me to the wagon. Whether that adrenaline was coming from fear or excitement, his mindset was clearly one of going into battle. The police had been led to expect bad things to go down.

The next day, the Chancellor met with about twenty faculty and librarians in his office, a colleague summed up my feelings exactly when they looked him in the eye and said, '*You* brought violence to our campus.' Unfortunately the Chancellor expressed no regret of remorse, not even willingness to reconsider whether his choice to mobilize the police had been correct. Now, when I hear stories of police repression, I get phantom pains in my wrists, and when many of us walk past the campus pond we confront unwelcome visions of riot police marching in formation. None of that had to happen. The Chancellor's choices, beginning back in October and culminating on May seventh, led us to this eventuality, and that is why I am voting no confidence in Chancellor Reyes. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Someone at the microphone on the left to speak against, please. You're recognized to speak.

Gloria DiFulvio: I rise to speak against the motion. First, I'd like to share a little information about the issue of people feeling unsafe. And I've heard from my colleagues and from my students. One example, a chapter of the cadet program of Civil Air Patrol meetings on the UMass campus on Monday evenings. This is a group for middle and high school students to learn about STEM, aeronautics, leadership, and community support such as search and rescue operations. Cadets were told not to walk on campus during protests, because they wear uniforms, and adult leaders feared for their safety.

One faculty member said, they have a Jewish student who she advises, who express very serious concerns about his safety and welfare, starting in October. On the day that the second encampment was built on campus, he expressed very serious fears about walking home. As his advisor, this professor felt powerless about what she could do to provide him with safety on campus.

Another faculty member spoke to me at the GSS meeting. What was a complete dismissal of fear of antisemitism that faculty and others have seen on this campus. During the GSS meeting, when the President was speaking about fears of Jewish students on this campus, people were putting hundreds of laugh emojis into the Zoom Meeting, and as this person stated, I'm disgusted that members of our community would dismiss the feelings of fear and hate that have perpetuated across campus, and I do not understand how some members of our community do not acknowledge how decisions have to be made to protect all students and all members of our community in this kind of environment.

These are just a few examples to add on to the other examples where students have felt unsafe and have had deep concerns which were heightened as this second encampment was built, and this encampment was more than tents. When the encampment was disassembled, there were 2000 pounds of wooden material that had been used to build barricades. Given the lack of questions we were really able to ask during the question-and-answer period, which was short, I had questions. Let me backtrack for one second.

This campus has been fully invested in diversity, equity, and inclusion, and we're lucky to live in a state and a place where we can still use these words. But a core value of this campus is creating an environment where all students, faculty, and staff can feel included and feel safe on this campus. And this is messy work. With this in mind, I have some questions that I didn't get answered, and along with others, say we need to not have this vote right now. But if we are going to, these are some of the questions I would have had-

Presiding Officer Brewer: You've reached your three-minute period, so please wrap up promptly.

Gloria DiFulvio: I will wrap up. Specifically, the issue of no confidence does have a meaning, that the Chancellor is unfit to do his job and given that I don't think that because we disagree with his decision that he is unfit to do his job, I would like to make an amendment to this motion.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I'm sorry an amendment is not in order at this time given that you've already spoken. I mentioned in the ground rules that if you wish to rise to make an amendment, that you should announce that at the beginning of your time.

Gloria DiFulvio: I checked in, and that's like the info I was given, so sorry about that.

Secretary Paik: Point of order.

Gloria DiFulvio: So do I not-

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary, you have the floor.

Secretary Paik: Just it looks like maybe the Speaker was provided inaccurate information by a member of the Rules Committee.

Senator Olsen: I'll own that.

Gloria DiFulvio: Yeah, I did check before.

Secretary Paik: So the member is saying that the provided guidance communicated that the speaker can speak and make a motion, whether or not the speaker can make a motion. **[This line is a best approximation due to some audio issues.]**

Presiding Officer Brewer: So you may make your motion. What's your motion?

Gloria DiFulvio: My motion is to amend this motion, to change the no confidence in Chancellor Reyes to censure of Chancellor Reyes.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So your motion has been made. Do you have a second?

Unknown Faculty in Audience: Second.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So the motion has been made and seconded. Do you wish to speak to the motion?

Gloria DiFulvio: I did. I feel we have not enough information to go with the definition of no confidence, which is that the Chancellor is unfit to do his job, and it seems that people do have concerns about the decision he made, and it fits better with the censure vote versus no confidence.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So I would now like to have everyone put hands down, and we're going to move to a discussion of the amendment to change the words, no confidence to censure, and so let's develop a new speaking order. If you would like to speak for the motion to amend, then you can stand at microphone right. If you'd like to speak against the motion to amend, you can stand at microphone left. And since we just did right and left on the floor. I'm now going to look for right and left, or for and against via Zoom. And so, if you would like to speak for the motion to amend via zoom, please indicate with a thumbs up if you'd like speak against indicate with the thumbs down.

Secretary Paik: Parliamentary inquiry, Presiding Officer.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary Paik: Yes, thank you. Can you clarify that, because there is an amendment on the floor, or the motion has been accepted for debate, that individuals can again, if they've already spoken, can now speak once again before.

Presiding Officer Brewer: That's correct. If you, even if you've spoken, you may now speak for or against the amendment, and then, when we return back to the original motion, we'll need to then continue with the rule that if you've spoken, you cannot speak again until everyone else has spoken.

Unknown Speaker: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order. You have the floor.

Unknown Speaker: Thank you. The point of order I would like to ask is in the initial email that some folks got as a test email before we come to a vote, will there be some sort of another test or confidence that more than 120 people will receive the correct ballot? And would you mind explaining that clearly before we actually go to a vote, so that folks feel confident that their vote will be made?

Presiding Officer Brewer: So I believe that the Secretary will be able to tell us exactly how many people actually receive the ballot and vote when we get the results. And so, if we have any questions about whether or not the vote that we receive is valid, we can address them at that time. But, Mr. Secretary, if you wish to make additional comments you're recognized to speak.

Secretary Paik: Thank you, Presiding Officer. So, having looked at the data from the initial test, I would say about 50% of the faculty assembled in this meeting did not correctly fill out the form, and hence we had a little bit of a mishap. I currently am ready to launch a survey of 887 emails to registered faculty members. However, if you have come in late, you may not be on this list. So if you do not get the next vote email, contact the project assistant from the Faculty Senate Office, who has been fielding hundreds of emails. We can continue sending hundreds more emails to Caitlyn.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you, Secretary. So again, if you wish to speak for the amendment, stand at microphone right. If you wish to speak against the amendment stand at microphone left. And I'm going to go to zoom right now first, if you're on Zoom, and you wish to speak for the amendment, respond with a thumbs up.

Unknown Speaker: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order. You have the floor.

Unknown Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I'm wondering what we should do, especially since we have a long line of people standing up here at the right mic who were going to speak for the original motion. How should we handle that line versus the new lines we are creating.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So my understanding is that well, we can- that's a very good question. Normally my experience is that you form a new line to begin speaking for the revised amendment or amended motion, if it is amended. But we can return back to the same order.

Senator Olsen: Sit in this row in order, and then we know.

Unknown Speaker: So those of us in line should sit down in order so we can reform our line after?

Senator Olsen: Correct.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I see Hoang Phan has a hand raised. And I'm asking if Hoang Phan wishes to speak about the amendment and so, since they're on zoom, I'm going to unmute them. You're recognized to speak about the amendment.

Hoang Phan: I'll speak against this amendment as long as I can also speak, for the motion after this amendment is defeated.

Presiding Officer Brewer: You may speak for the original motion afterwards. Right now the question on the floor is about the amendment. You wish to speak against the amendment?

Hoang Phan: Okay, I'm going to speak against the amendment, yes. Will I begin?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, please begin.

Hoang Phan: Okay, I speak against this amendment. The speaker proposing this amendment has suggested, we need to slow down, facts are in dispute, and then suggested hearsay about students claims, other people's claims about how they felt about that protest. I speak to my colleagues who may be undecided on this amendment. A few faculty who's been speaking in opposition to the motion have suggested that we do not have enough facts about the events that unfolded after militarized police were called. This is not a police inquiry. This motion is not about that. This motion is not an inquiry into what exactly precisely happened each and every minute of that protest that was peaceful. That- this is not the facts.

What is this for? This is about the Chancellor and his decision making and the values of our university, the long history of political protest, public demonstrations by our students, by our staff, by our faculty at this public university, the values of encouraging free speech, public engagement, civic engagement. those are the values of our university. This is the flagship campus of the UMass system.

So not in dispute. In 2016, a coalition of student organizations in 2016 did the exact same thing that UMass Dissenters and SJP did at Whitmore. They sat in the building and they stayed after hours. The code they violated was it was closing time after 6 PM. They-

Secretary Paik: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary.

Secretary Paik: Yes, the amendment on the floor is to amend the language for censure. I believe this would constitute debate. Can you make a ruling?

Hoang Phan: I'm speaking to what the person who moved this amendment spoke to. the person who moved this had a long prologue about all their facts in dispute. I'm addressing everything that was in that motion. I dispute what this- whoever's just said that.

Presiding Officer Brewer: You may continue to speak on the amendment.

Hoang Phan: Can I continue?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, you may continue.

Hoang Phan: Okay, I'm speaking exactly to the amendment. So this is not about the facts in dispute. The facts that I'm saying are facts that are not in dispute. The decision making of this Chancellor. They're saying- we- this is about a police inquery, all these things. This is about this decision making of this Chancellor. He refused to meet with the students.

In 2016 our previous Chancellor met with the students, and no sanctions were brought against them. In fact, they were celebrated. Just recently in this past fall, SJP, Students for Justice in Palestine and UMass Dissenters did the exact same thing. They all face student code of conduct charges and civil cases, similar.

Facts not in dispute. There was a peaceful encampment just this last academic year by student coalition protesting student housing crisis. No police were called in. It was a peaceful encampment that lasted with structures and tents, and they took it down themselves after they exercised their free speech rights and expressed their political perspectives, but not in dispute. This chancellor treated the same act a peaceful encampment at the same site completely different. Called in militarized police, state, local, county. Riot police. He officially called it so that is not in dispute. Facts, 300 undergraduate students participated in a student government association survey-

Presiding Officer Brewer: You're at time.

Hoang Phan: Reporting on whether they should vote no confidence in this Chancellor. 91% of them vote in no confidence in this Chancellor. So this vote of no confidence. This motion is not about this censure amendment, this motion is about should stand as it was brought. I encourage all my colleagues to vote against this amendment, stick to the facts, not be distracted, be diverted by the opposition who brought this.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you.

Hoang Phan I'll stop now. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So this was zoom. There's nobody else with their hand raised via zoom. And so we're now going to go to the right hand side for people that would like to speak for the amendment. You're recognized to speak for the amendment. Is there anyone at the right-hand microphone to speak for the amendment?

Amilcar Shabazz: Is this the right or left side?

Senator Olsen: That's right. So that is, you're going to speak in favor of the amendment.

Amilcar Shabazz: You want to speak in favor of considering this amendment. Yes. I heard earlier with the discussion of the meaning of no confidence.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Please identify yourself.

Amilcar Shabazz: Yes, Shabazz from the department of African American studies.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you.

Amilcar Shabazz: So the answer that was given did not quote this language of unfit. I think that language of unfit, Chancellor Reyes being unfit to continue to serve, was referencing a petition that came out prior to the petition for us to have this meeting, and I didn't support that. I didn't support the call for his resignation as being based on that he was unfit to continue serving. I respect faculty members who feel that way and who've reached that conclusion, but at the time of the deadline for that resignation petition, I do not support it.

So it leaves me here as well, trying to see if that phrase, no confidence is taken in that same way that it's saying that the Chancellor is beyond redemption. He needs to go. If this no confidence means we, as the faculty, are calling for him to quit calling, for him to be removed. If that's what this language no confidence means, I'm not sure I'm there yet, even today. And I'm not saying how I'm gonna vote, going back to the original, we go back to the original. I'm still not sure.

I'm hearing a lot of compelling things from my students, from the members of the community, from alums. And I hear my faculty members here today. This is very compelling, what Professor Briggs and Professor de Leon present. Very strong, very compelling. Okay, but it's so that the Chancellor and whomever else was talking to him, people like Victor Woolridge, who writes today, you know, in the opinion piece, a friend, my friend Victor Woolridge, who writes that we're doing wrong here. Okay, I get that as well. But for me, this isn't a question of did the Chancellor do wrong? He did!

It's a question of what does no confidence mean! You're saying he should be fired, and I get he messed up in October. I get he messed up again. Two strikes. We want to say he's out. If that's what it means, then I'm questioning that. And I hope the other sideline, if there, can help respond to that.

Final thing that I would say what people need to do, who want more information, go back and read the report of the Blarney blowout from back in 2018. I was in the Chancellor's office then. I was there. None of us gathered in a difficult confidence for Swammy. For calling out the troops. Troops were called from all over. But why? Because hundreds, thousands of students were walking out of **[undecipherable]**, walking out of the door, the dorms, the apartment ready to fight the police! People were swarmed, could be in the swarm of these movements, and you couldn't get police there if someone was being raped. It was so-

Presiding Officer Brewer: You've reached the end of your time. Please conclude.

Amilcar Shabazz: And nobody here opposed that. T=That what happened on May seventh is nothing like Blarney mob, and was completely wrong. But I hope to hear more how we mean this no confidence.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you, Professor Shabazz. You're recognized at the left microphone to speak against the amendment.

Sanjiv Gupta: Yeah, I'm not sure I can follow that. But in reference to censure, confidence is somewhat subjective. I think most of us who sort of are behind this mean something like the following, that we don't believe that the Chancellor is telling the truth, that they're acting in our best interest as faculty, that he's acting the best interest of our students, and perhaps higher education more generally. Those who wish to substitute censure are welcome to vote against this motion, and then, you know, do the thing over themselves. So I'm actually gonna request a ruling from the Presiding Officer that this proposed amendment is diluting again, the you know, the time that is meant for us on the main motion.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. We're now going to go to zoom if you've got your hand raised in zoom-

Secretary Paik: Point of order, Presiding Officer.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary Paik: I believe you had a request. The speaker wanted you to issue a ruling on whether or not the amendment was trying to delay.

Presiding Officer Brewer: It seems to me that it was a perfectly comprehensible amendment that to change some of the wording of the motion.

Sanjiv Gupta: I know. So I'm not saying **[Audio unintelligible]** or unintentional. I am asking you to make a ruling on whether it was dilation, which I think has a specific meeting here. That is, the intention is to delay debate on the main motion, which they can very easily vote against, and simply make a new motion for censure.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I don't understand your point, I'm sorry. It seems to me that we have a proposed amendment on the floor that would change the wording of the motion. And we're currently considering that and having speak for against that. And eventually we will come to a vote as to whether or not to change the wording of the motion

[Many unrecognized speakers begin arguing in the room.]

Presiding Officer Brewer: I'm now planning to go to Zoom. I see that two people have their hands raised in zoom. If anyone would like speak in favor of the amendment. Please indicate with a thumbs up, and if you'd like, speak against the amendment, indicate with the thumbs down.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I see someone interested in speaking for the amendment. Ken Kleinman, you're recognized to speak for the amendment.

Ken Kleinman: Yeah point of order. If we want to vote on this question now, we just say, move the previous question?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Correct. You can move the previous question, and then we will aim to have a two-thirds ballot to see whether or not two-thirds of the audience supports moving the question, would you-

Ken Kleinman: I'd like to move this question to a vote. I move the previous question.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So this is not debatable, so Mr. Secretary, are you ready to send out question on the amendment.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of information.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes. Question.

Unidentified Speaker: I can speak, speaking for myself, and perhaps for other people, I still don't have a test ballot. I requested from the Senate Faculty Office Assistant to receive a ballot, so I'm concerned about the ability of our faculty to vote on this motion as well as other.

[Unrecognized audience members speak over one another, explaining that there is no test ballot.]

Presiding Officer Brewer: **[Inaudible]** test ballot. The secretary is authorized to speak. Mr. Secretary.

Secretary Paik: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. There is concern in the room, and I have to agree that I am anxious about sending out the next batch. With so many people filling out the survey incorrectly, it creates problems, but if you allow us to run another test, try again, and ask Caitlyn Foster to ignore the hundreds of emails she has received and we'll start fresh with additional requests for emails if you didn't get this next test. But hopefully, that will get us started. So if you would allow a big test, let me try that again.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So it sounds to me like we're going to do another test ballot and then, having concluded the test ballot, we will return to the question of the amendment. Is that correct, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Paik: That's correct. I will be sending this to 887 contacts, probably a record number, so we'll see how this-

Ken Kleinman: And another point of information.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of information.

Ken Kleinman: What's the timing on when we should expect to get this test ballot by.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Paik: Difficult question. We'll see how fast the systems are.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I see a number of people with hands raised via zoom. If you have a point of information to ask by zoom make sure it keep you keep your hand up, otherwise take your hand down and so I'm gonna go through those.

Ken Kleinman: I didn't hear the answer to my question. I heard the secretary say something.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I believe the secretary said that he's going to send them out, and we'll see how long it takes.

Ken Kleinman: Oh, okay, thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Graciela, you're recognized to speak.

Graciela Monteagudo: Thank you. I just want to inform that I am unable to vote. I haven't received an email to allow me to vote, although I did sign up in Qualtrics, and I'm still unable to understand when the secretary speaks, so thank you for repeating the words of the secretary.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you, I'll try to continue to do that. And were you able to send to projectasst@umass.edu?

Graciela Monteagudo: I'll try that again.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Okay. Thank you.

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary Paik: May I send a test vote?

Secretary Paik: It has been sent.

Presiding Officer Brewer: It has been sent. I'm now going to go to the next person in the list here. Hoang Phan, do you have a point of information?

Hoang Phan: I was hoping you could just read more slowly the email address I should send it to, because I still haven't- I did the Qualtrics registration, but I haven't received it. It was a while ago. So what's the email address?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Just a moment here, and let me do it this way.

Secretary Paik: Mr. Presiding Officer, I have 80 emails failed, seven bounced **[inaudible due to unrecognized audience members speaking]**.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Do you see the email address now?

Unidentified Speaker: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order.

Unidentified Speaker: Hi, so I got the email. And I clicked the link. I just wanna be clear. Is this like a test vote? Or is this like a vote vote?

Presiding Officer Brewer: This is just a test vote. It is not- We're just simply testing the system to make sure that we can send votes out and receive them, and see what proportion we get.

Unidentified Speaker: It just says, you're voting for motion two. So I just wanted to-

Presiding Officer Brewer: We will return to the amendment, which is the what's currently on the floor. This is only a test vote. Jayati Ghosh, do you have a point of information?

Jayati Ghosh: Yes, please, I think many of us on zoom are struggling about twelve people I know haven't received any response even to emails to projectassistance@umass.edu, I have received an email from her saying that I'm registered, but I have received nothing thereafter. And many people basically haven't got anything despite a lot of emails. So I suspect more than half of those on Zoom haven't really got anything that would enable them to vote. I got an email that I'm registered, but I have no capacity to vote.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. We'll take that under advisement. Irene Dujovne, do you have a point of order?

Irene Dujovne: Yes, I think since we have numbers, it would be great to know how many people have been sent, so how many people have been sent the email because this is a two-sided vote. So it has to- We don't need to know how many people have been registered. How many people- What are the answers that we get? So it would be great, so that we know the numbers in advance.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary, could you respond to that question?

Secretary Paik: Yes, thank you. We sent out 870 emails and in terms of the distribution, I believe there were around 15 that were rejected because people did not register correctly. So if you didn't get it, please- We asked Caitlyn to delete every email she received up to this point, and from this point please email Caitlyn if you did not get the test vote, and we will start adding you to the next vote. Please if you came in later, you are not registered as an attendee, we have a manual process to do that, but it takes a little time. There's always this kind of lag if you came in late, **[inaudible]**. From this point on, Caitlyn will delete all the emails she has received up until this point, and she'll just start tracking the ones she received from this test vote. If you do not get the email, email Caitlyn and she will add you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So when you say email Caitlyn, does that mean email projectasst@umass.edu?

Secretary Paik: That is correct.

Presiding Officer Brewer: If you do not receive this test ballot, if you've not received it promptly, then email projectasst@umass.edu, and then we'll try this again. Roberto Alejandro, do you have a point of information?

Roberto Alejandro: Yeah, I just want to record that I haven't received the test vote. And I have sent three emails.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Right. But all of the previous emails have now been deleted and we're starting over again. So if you do not receive this test vote that's just been sent out. Then email project assistant one more time and we will try again. Thank you.

Roberto Alejandro: Thank you.

Graduate Assistant Foster: Mr. Presiding Officer, may I be recognized? I'm the project assistant. Sorry.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, you may speak. You are recognized Caitlyn.

Graduate Assistant Foster: I have about 80 emails when I last closed my inbox. Please be patient with me. I'm about twenty minutes behind. If you haven't received a response from me yet, I promise I'll get to it, or I have two people helping me. Someone will respond, just please be patient. I'm sorry, and thank you!

Presiding Officer Brewer: Professor Baskin, you're recognized to speak for a point of order.

Tobias Baskin: Thank you. I would just like to request that the secretary put in something defining the motion on the Qualtrics thing that we get to vote. So far, the things that I've gotten just say vote for motion one vote for motion two. But given how it's hard to hear on zoom, and so forth, and so forth, it would be very nice if this Qualtrics thing said, vote for motion two in favor, you know some, some at least summary of what you're voting for. It doesn't have to be verbatim, but just something so we know what we're doing. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you very much. Professor Baskin. Isabella Weber, do you have a point of information.

Isabella Weber: Yes, thank you. My question is, if we look at the numbers of people who have queued in the different queues, they seem to be extremely unequal, and if we call on the pro and against speakers by equal proportions, this means that the likelihood to get a chance to speak is extremely unequal, and I wonder whether we could take account of those who are in one queue and those who are in the other queue, and then call on them proportionately so, for example, if that twice as many people in the queue for the motion that these people get called on twice as often just to ensure an equality of chances to speak at this meeting. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: That's not my understanding of how the way alternating will go, that is, once we've reached where there's nobody on the opposing side of one side, for or against, then at that point we will declare an end of debate, and we will have a vote at that point.

Isabella Weber: The meeting has been running for two and a half hours, and we have been running into many technical issues. So I'm not sure if this is a viable solution, given the current circumstance.

Presiding Officer Brewer: It's the best that we're able to do with what we have at hand. Thank you. Kathryn Lachman, do you have a point of order?

Kathryn Lachman: I do. I just want to report that I've received two surveys now, inviting me to vote on motion two twice, so I'm concerned that there might be issues with the voting if others similarly receive multiple surveys.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Laurie Salame, do you have a point of order?

Laurie Salame: I just have a point of order regarding voting, since a couple hundred people have left the zoom room, and presumably people have left the live room, and it said you had to be present to vote. If you registered at the beginning of this meeting, you were present. If you did not stay until the end, you are not, but you will still be given the link to vote, yes or no.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary, do you have a response to that question?

Senator Olsen: The Secretary is engaged. One moment.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary, the question is, people that registered at the beginning of the meeting by Zoom or in the room, and then subsequently left, presumably they will still be able to vote. Is that your understanding? And is that appropriate?

Secretary Paik: In theory I guess they couldn't go, and we're not really tracking who’s leaving. I don't know if they would know what they're voting on. So I'm open to suggestions here.

Unidentified Speaker: Hey, Tony, I have a point of order. I think we have a technical shit show here.

Senator Olsen: Please don’t laugh let’s keep decorum.

Unidentified Speaker: If there is a record of people who've been here, as the previous speaker online says, then this could be done asynchronous. You know, who's registered?

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer, may I respond?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary, you have the floor.

Secretary Paik: Thank you for the suggestion from my colleague. Again, I apologize for all the technical issues, this is very novel for us. So we could break out the paper ballots if you would like, as an alternative **[inaudible]** format. Unfortunately, because we have issues on, you know, amendments and the debates, I don't think I'd be like a super **[inaudible]**.

Senator Olsen: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order.

Senator Olsen: Presiding Officer, would you please reiterate the voting eligibility?

Presiding Officer Brewer: So my understanding is that people that have faculty rank or librarian rank at half time or more are eligible to speak and vote at this meeting. And that those who are present at the meeting, was our determination, are those that are going to be able to vote. But it seems to me that people that arrived, and perhaps left if they still are able to vote, they were present at the meeting, even if they are not necessarily present at the time that voting takes place.

I see a point of order from Christine Turner. You are recognized to speak, Christine.

Christine Turner: Thank you, Presiding officer. This is a point of information. After we vote for the amendment to the motion, how would we, or how would I, call the question on the main resolution? Is it with a, on zoom, a hand up to speak in favor or against? Or doesn't it matter?

Presiding Officer Brewer: It does not matter. You can use either one.

Christine Turner: Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary? Are we ready to try a vote? I believe that we've called the question on the amendment, do you wish to do another test, or are you ready to try and vote on the amendment?

Unidentified Speaker: I just have a procedural question, point of information, to try to maybe pre-empt, if possible, as Dawn said, the technological shit show. Are we recording votes within a specific window of time? And thus all the legitimate votes be registered within that time. I'm trying to forestall the challenges **[inaudible]**.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary, I'll let you answer that question.

Secretary Paik: I can see what is delivered **[inaudible]**, but you need to make the call on when to close the voting time.

Unrecognized Speaker: Are we voting on calling the question? Is that what-

Presiding Officer Brewer: The question that is currently on the floor is the question to amend the motion, to replace the words no confidence with censure

[Several unrecognized audience members speak over one another.]

Presiding Officer Brewer: That's the question that's been moved. And so right now, we're going to have a vote to see if we reach the two-thirds level to call the question, and then to have that vote. That's what that's the vote that we're currently talking about having. But, as I understand it, the only ballots that have been sent out so far are test ballots.

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer, we will send to 887 contacts, if you do not receive this vote, please email Caitlyn Foster. If you did not receive it we will add you, you will receive it hopefully the next cycle. **[inaudible]** I'm ready to do it when you would, Presiding Officer.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So, Mr. Secretary, I'm not sure I totally understood exactly what you're saying. Are you saying you're sending out yet another test ballot.

[Multiple unrecognized audience members speak over one another.]

Secretary Paik: No, we are sending out the motion on the previous question, which is called the question. The subject of this email will be Vote on **[Inaudible]**

[Audience members continue arguing].

Presiding Officer Brewer: Right, so you've sent off the ballot. Let us know when you have an answer.

Senator Messier: Point of information.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of information.

Senator Messier: I just wanna clarify that right now we are voting to call the question. We're not voting on the question of-

Presiding Officer Brewer: Right. Now we're voting to call the question about whether or not we're ready to vote on the amendment, or whether we will continue to discuss the amendment. Right now, that's the question that's on the floor, is we're going to go try and determine whether or not we continue discussing the amendment, or if we're ready to vote on the amendment.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of information. I did receive a survey but it says motion two once again.

[Multiple unrecognized audience members say that they are experiencing the same. Many voices are heard talking over one another.]

Secretary Paik: **[Inaudible due to noise from the audience.]**

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary, I'm unable to hear you. Will people in the audience please be quiet so that I can hear what the secretary is saying, I believe with the noise it's making it difficult for those of us on Zoom to hear. Mr. Secretary, would you please tell audience what's happening.

Senator Olsen: Mr. Presiding officer, may I speak for him?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, thank you, Senator Olsen.

Senator Olsen: Yes, what happened is that you will if you receive the ballots that is correctly in your email label. Question , you click on the link. It'll it still says, Question . And he said, ignore that it is for question , which is to end discussion and call a question.

Secretary Paik: **[Inaudible due to noise from the audience.]**

Unidentified Speaker: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Would the audience please be quiet, so I can hear the point of order.

Unidentified Speaker: On every subsequent vote, could the email and the Qualtrics survey state clearly the motion so it's clear what we're voting on each time, same as the meeting, where the motion will be read out before we vote on it. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Secretary, could you please make sure that the questions that are sent out aren't just motion 1, 2, 3, but clearly, unambiguously indicate what the actual question is that's being voted on.

Secretary Paik: Yes, thank you Presiding Officer, I will do that.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you very much. I see many people that have hands raised via zoom. If you have a point of order that you would like to ask, please-

[Unintelligible audio from the room.]

Presiding Officer Brewer: Please your hand on Zoom, unless you have a point of order that you'd like to ask.

Laurie Salame: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order.

Laurie Salame: Yes, so are we voting on this one that just came now and given that, it doesn't contain what we're actually voting on, what does a yes vote do? And what does a no vote do?

Presiding Officer Brewer: The yes vote will stop debate, and then we will vote on the amendment. A no vote will mean that we will continue to debate the amendment. Jayati Ghosh, do you have a point of order?

Jayati Ghosh: Yes, please. I think many of us who are on zoom have not received any survey. And these are all people who have been registered, and we still haven't received any questions. So there is a real concern about the voting.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Nicole Melton. Do you have a point of order.

Nicole Melton: Mine was the same that I haven't received an email to vote. And I was here since beginning.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Hossein Kazemi, do you have a point of order.

Hossein Kazemi: Same thing, no email at all. How could this be a fair vote?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Richard Chu, do you have a point of order?

Richard Chu: Yes, I haven't received my vote. I've sent already four or five emails. And I was wondering, is there a way where you can just raise your hand or put a thumbs up or down to vote on screen?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Given that there are 700 people in the zoom, I would not be able to count that number of people. And again, one of the reasons for doing the email is that then we can sure that the people that are voting are people that actually have the credentials to vote.

Senator Olsen: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order.

Senator Olsen: Could you please remind those on Zoom that they don't need to call a point of order to let us know again, get an email. They should instead direct that to the project assistant.

Presiding Officer Brewer: That point's been made, but I think that a number of people are concerned, that they've emailed project assistant several times and have not yet received a ballot of any kind. At this point I'm going to stop for a moment and ask the secretary for an update. Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer, I have 512 votes registered so far. 421 in favor, 48 against, 22 abstentions at this point.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of order. It appears that some people are not getting their ballots because they are being funneled into their "other" box on Outlook. If you use Outlook, check your "other" box.

Presiding Officer Brewer: If everybody on Zoom knows that if you're using Outlook, you need to check your other box because it sounds like the emails may be getting directed into there, rather than amongst your regular email. So check there to make sure that you received your ballot.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of order, Mr. Presiding officer.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order.

Unidentified Speaker: Is there a procedural rule that would allow you to determine that we are not able to vote fairly, and we could suspend this until such time as we could be sure that all faculty votes could be counted like maybe in the fall, when all these glitches have been corrected?

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary.

Secretary Paik: So what I would suggest is we could go back to the QR code approach. We'll have to trust everyone on the honor system. We display the QR code to vote and people who are eligible to vote vote and those are not don't vote.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary, I'm going to express some reservation about that, because people on Zoom do not necessarily have a convenient way to interact with the QR code. People that have a phone can do so. But people on zoom using a computer may not find it feasible to do that. If there's a particular URL that I can direct people to, perhaps we can provide that. Again, I have a long list of people that are on zoom that have raised their hands with points of order. I'm gonna try and start going through these. Janice Irvine, you have a point of order.

Janice Irvine: Yes, same problem as everyone else. I didn't even receive a registration email. And I've been sitting here now for more than two and a half hours and hoping to vote. And I've sent several emails to project assistant.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Kevin Kleinman

Ken Kleinman: So the point of order is while discussion is going on, there's no way for those of us on Zoom to raise a point of order, because we are all on forced mute. And so I don't think that's a fair way for people on Zoom to participate in the meeting. And then I had a suggestion. If there's a website or QR code, could we not do credentials and votes on the same page? And that would allow us to have a fair vote that would be run by zoom directly.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Katherine Reeves do you have a point of order or a question?

Katherine Reeves: Yes, thank you. A point of order. I agree with what was said earlier. I would, if there's any way to suspend this meeting, at least by a day, if not more, until a process that actually has some integrity to the vote could be established. It's pretty clear that this is not going to be an accurate vote. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you, Jayati Ghosh do you have a point of order?

Jayati Ghosh: Yes, I managed to get the link to the survey because a colleague very kindly just emailed it to me. Why don't you put the website link on the screen. And perhaps everybody can just use that because it's really

becoming a problem, otherwise. Many people are simply not getting the relevant email. But if you could share that link, I mean, I could email it or Caitlyn could email it to every- well, Caitlyn's emails are not reaching. But I mean, if you can put it on the screen here, or if there's- no chat function. But if there's something somewhere, you can put it on that people can go to that link.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of order

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Paik: Yes, Presiding Officer?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary, did you have a point of order?

Secretary Paik: No, I did not. But there's someone in the audience, that I think that has one.

Unidentified Speaker: I have just a brief suggestion for circulating the link from our department meetings. We usually have a Google Doc which can be updated with whatever current link needs to point people in the correct direction. Anybody can load the Google Doc once, it can be edited, live, by the secretary, or whoever is in charge of calling votes. So all people need is the URL to the single Google Doc. And in the future they can click whatever is the latest link to share there. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Isabel Espinal, do you have a point of order?

Isabel Espinal: Yeah. Another suggestion with the URL to make it easy, create a short URL and put it up on the screen. And also just letting you know I am on zoom, and I did not have a problem with the QR code. So just to report that and number three is we have spent a lot of time here. A lot of people like just made a lot of sacrifice to be here. So I would recommend that if we can't have the vote today, figure out a way that we can do an online vote, you know, in the next two days, 24 hours, whatever. But let's get this done, and not delay.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you for that. Input. Irene Dejovna. Point of order?

Irene Dujovne: Point of order. My concern is that if we are changing the rules of how we are voting two hours into the meeting, it's an issue with the people. I would be concerned. We are changing the rules as we are going along, and I understand that it's very frustrating, and things are not running smooth, but I would be hesitant of changing the rules of how- what was stated at the beginning of the meeting, and what is being done now, and we decide to change. That would be concerning for me.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Eric Learned Miller. Point of order.

Erik Learned Miller: Thank you. Can you hear me? So I don't know if Qualtrics is working this way for you folks, but when we use it in our faculty meetings, every person who votes remotely has a unique link that they use, so distributing a single link, at least in my experience, has not worked. But if the people using Qualtrics today know otherwise, I defer to them. Thanks.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you, that's my understanding as well. Leili Shahriyari.

Leili Shahriyari: Yes, I just got the link, but it says the vote for motion two, it would be helpful to define the motion to even in the notebook that you just right now, you shared, here that has the information email and this stuff. So you can also write down what is motion two?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Mr. Secretary, can you tell me where we're at in terms of voting?

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer, we have currently 500 yeses, 560 yeses, sorry, my apologies, 68 nos, and 31 absentions.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Let's see. So can you tell me those numbers again? Please? Number for?

Secretary Paik: For is 560, nos are 68, and 31 absentions. And there are obviously problems.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So it looks to me like we have achieved a two-thirds majority. And based on that, that means that we've called the previous question and the question is, Mr. Secretary, do you feel confident that we can now have a vote on the amendment?

Secretary Paik: Yes, please, I feel pretty confident, but I believe we should do this next one as QR code. If people are okay with it. Don't seem like a chance at that point. That would be my recommendation.

Unrecognized Speaker: Point of order. Question. Not everybody can read a QR code. I think that was the original problem. Can you please send a link? Not a QR code, especially for the people on Zoom. But a lot of people here are also computers and not phones. They can't read a QR code.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, if you can give me a QR code, or if you can give me the link…

Secretary Paik: Yes, we can do a link.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Question, point of order.

Unidentified Speaker: I think we established that sharing a link will not suffice. But it does seem like the project assistant has done an excellent job compiling a lot of effected emails. So could we just move forward with distributing the survey over email? Given, I think, out of 800 people you said are here like, at least 600 are getting the emails.

[Multiple people in the room begin loudly arguing with one another.]

Presiding Officer Brewer: My understanding is that the QR code that he would send out would take you to a website. And at that website you would simply vote directly rather than to have Qualtrics, emails which admittedly Qualtrics emails are unique. Each URL that's sent to each person via email is unique. And so those Urls cannot be shared. But the QR code email, the QR code link, is simply a website that will accept a response. And I believe that is what the secretary is proposing that we do. Can you clarify if that's true, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Paik: It would be- it would not be a secure link, but it would be, you know, accessible, either by QR code or by link.

Unidentified Speaker: Can I make one more remark? Well, we just successfully executed a vote, so can we just do the same thing again? And if there's a margin that's too small, then we reconsider. But like, if the margin is like the boat we just had, there's no amount of messed up votes that could have changed that outcome.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I think that's probably the best way to proceed. It looks to me like the voting system by email is working well enough. Those were the rules that we agreed to at the beginning. And so let's simply move forward with that, and we'll see what the vote totals are. And if we think-

Unrecognized Speaker: My apologies. I know this is contentious. My concern would be that they're just really difficult questions about what margin would be acceptable, and I worry that in future votes that are close, exercising discretion over what's an acceptable margin of error is going to create a lot of difficulties for this body and the perceived legitimacy of outcomes. I would urge that we not eyeball votes.

Second Unrecognized Speaker: I have an even bigger point of order. A QR code is not- we can go in there three times and vote. I'm not secure- and this isn't about voting for like cotton candy or gum drops for dinner. It's a vote of no confidence for our Chancellor, which again means some of it to do his job. We all need the right to vote legitimately and feel confident in who voted is a member of the faculty, and has voted once.

Third Unrecognized Speaker: Point of order. We have a system to do that. And can we just agree that, like, if there is a statistically impossible threshold by which a vote could not have succeeded, even if all of the people who didn't vote both in a certain way. So can we just move ahead with that? Please?

Presiding Officer Brewer: So Mr. Secretary, it sounds to me like the body is raising significant questions about the reliability of the voting system, and whether or not it's going to be possible to have a reliable voting system during the reasonable period that we could meet today. Based on that, I'm going to ask *you* directly, do you think that we should consider recessing and then reevaluating a voting system that's going to work and then reconvening at such time as we're able to execute such a voting system?

Secretary Paik: I believe we should continue on with the system that we currently have. Caitlyn, with assistance of other family members, are adding people manually, and if you give me once, maybe some of our demand process, give me a few minutes to make sure I have all the details in there, but we can launch the next survey.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Shall we recess for several minutes for people to use the bathroom and take a break, and then we will reconvene, say, at- what would you suggest, Mr. Secretary? At 4 o'clock?

Secretary Paik: Maybe 4:05? Give us a few minutes?

Presiding Officer Brewer: We are recessed until 4:05. We will return at 4:05.

[The meeting recesses until 4:05 PM.]

Presiding Officer Brewer: It is now 4:05. Please take your seats and we will resume the meeting. My understanding is that we currently are on the question to amend and let me share the screen... That the subject of the amendment was to change the words, no confidence to censure Chancellor Reyes. The motion was made to move the previous question, which we decided via vote to do so, and so now we are on this question. And, Mr. Secretary, I will ask you if you believe we're ready to have the vote on this question.

Secretary Paik: Just give me about five more minutes. We have 998 emails at this point. And I believe one of the issues was that some emails might have gone to your junk mails, so please be sure to check junk mail, and also when you entered your information on the form it autocorrected to capitalized letters we fixed those issues. So currently we are at 998 **[Inaudible]**.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So the substance of what you said, as I understand it, for people on zoom, is that we're you're going to wait 5 more minutes, and then you're going to issue the vote for the amendment. Is that correct?

Secretary Paik: That is correct.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Very good.

Secretary Paik: And just to clarify it, will it? Will read ‘motion 4: amendment’. That's it. So, yes or no. So Presiding Officer, can you explain what a yes vote will be on the amendment?

Presiding Officer Brewer: So. Yes, if you vote yes on the amendment you will change the words ‘No confidence in’ to ‘censure’. **[The Presiding Officer attempts to add this to language to his shared screen via a digital sticky note.]** There is that clear enough? Can people see that? It's not ideal, but-

Secretary Paik: Mr. Presiding officer, your sticky note is just showing a sticky note icon. If you open it, we may be able to read it.

Presiding Officer Brewer: It's open on my screen so that just doesn't work. Sorry. It doesn't show up on the zoom share.

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary? Yes, you're recognized.

Secretary Paik: Thank you, Presiding Officer. I have populated the motion with the motion to amend: censure in the subject line. There are 992 contacts. Also of those who are having trouble, my deepest apologies. This is like an unprecedented situation, and it's led to, you know, basically very quick set of strategies which some are working some are not.

And also, I wanna thank all of us that are busily entering names. And I apologize to those who are waiting. We're trying our best, and I want everyone to have a chance to vote. If you are unable to vote this round, please, email Caitlyn. But please indicate it was from the last round of voting, which is the motion to amend: censure. So we, I believe are ready.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So you may issue the vote. Go ahead. Let's vote!

Secretary Paik: So just be clear, motion to amend: censure. Yes, means you agree to the motion to amend, man no willing to are not in favor to amend.

Presiding Officer Brewer: This requires just a simple majority. I see several people on Zoom. I'm going to go through the people on zoom that have raised their hands. Alice Cheung, do you have a point of order?

Alice Cheung: No, I just want to urge that I cannot get emails, despite being recognized from the start by the QR code. And I wrote several emails back to project assist, and there was no email. And I wrote to you directly, which I don't expect you to be checking emails, but I need to register that there may be more people like me who have attended but could not register a vote. And I would like- I would urge you to ask those of us who is in the same situation raise our hands so we can have a head-count, that's all.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. If you have not, so I see several other people that have hands raised. So please lower your please lower your hand unless you've not received a test ballot of any kind. So I see one- I see more than a dozen people. Let me get it trying to do it. I see thirty-three people. So it appears I have thirty-three people that say that they have not received any ballot at all. Is that correct? Thirty-four people claim that they have not received any ballot at all.

Senator Olsen: Point of information.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of information.

Senator Olsen: Mr. Presiding Officer, could you please remind everyone to also check their junk mail, also check their other folder.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Please make sure that you're checking- you've checked your junk mail and your other folder to make sure that these messages are not getting misdirected.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of information. Can we get a clarity on what would constitute a forum of voting in the general faculty **[Inaudible]**.

Presiding Officer Brewer: A general meeting is a quorum of the people that attend.

Senator Messier: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order.

Senator Messier: So I'm Alison Messier, from the Rules Committee and also librarian. I've been sitting by the door catching people, trying to help the project assistant with adding email addresses. One thing that I will mention is that a lot of folks, if you have an iPhone, your iPhone auto corrected your email and capitalized your first letter of your email address, which we think is why people weren't getting emails. It's case sensitive. Okay, I have had a couple of

people bring that to my attention. The other thing is check your junk and check, if you have one of those prioritized outlook emails, check all of your other inboxes because people are finding their emails in junk. Also, please, we're doing our best. This is new for all of us. And I'm trying to be as patient as I can with everyone who's coming to me and sending stuff to Caitlyn. So I really appreciate if we could just be patient. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you, Alison. If you're if you're on zoom, go ahead and please lower your hands now so that I can keep track of people that have points of order or points of information, etc. We've received the information that a number of people have not received ballots.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I noticed that, just as a point of information, the Faculty Senate assistant just responded to somebody from Zoom and indicated that they're 20 minutes behind on all emails. Just so that you know where we stand. Hoang Phan, do you have a point of information? Or a point of order?

Unidentified Speaker: Hey, Presiding Officer, would you mind repeating yourself? Sorry about that, the audio went down for a second in the room. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So really, my most recent message, was to say that I was copied on an email that was sent out by the Faculty Senate assistant to one of the people on Zoom to say that they're that they were re-added. But that they're 20 minutes behind on emails. Mr. Secretary, may I ask for a status report?

Secretary Paik: We have received, I believe, 600 responses via Qualtrics, and by email. Presiding Officer would you like the results?

Presiding Officer Brewer: When you're ready- when you believe that we're ready to announce results, you may do so.

Secretary Paik: Thank you Presiding Officer. The outcome at this point is, let's call it at this point, 269 yeses, 399 nos, and 25 abstentions.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So that suggests that we will reject this suggestion to amend the motion. And we are now back on the main motion, and if you wish to speak on the main motion, please lower your hands on zoom as well, and if you wish to speak on the main motion, if you wish to speak against the main motion again, the microphone on the left, if you wish to speak for the motion the microphone on the right and I can't remember whether we were on zoom or on the floor before, but let's go with the floor, so if you wish to speak for the motion on the right, You're recognized to speak.

Unidentified Speaker: Though I'm solely tempted to call the question, I do want to speak to remind us why we're here, and because we haven't heard from a librarian, aside from my wonderful colleague, Alison. I work in the library, and Robert S. Cox special collections and university Archives Research Center, or SCUA. But I speak for myself. We are known as the archive of social change, and we specialize in information which many people are asking about. My colleagues and I are internally where the core values of this campus and how they've been shaped over time. And I would say I'm speaking for the motion in particular the first two points.

We are proud to celebrate student demonstrations about local and international issues, and a critical facet of our identity as a campus. The first graduating class protested work requirements on campus. It was for activism, the naming of the library for W.E.B DuBois. It was student activism that led to the creation of the AfroAM Department and New African House. Most people don't know about true University City in 1969, which was a very well organized demonstration for a variety of issues. The spokesperson for that encampment cited the inability of existing structures to accommodate individual learning needs, and then sort of visited the site to observe. You can read the short articles from the Daily Collegian online to see how administration responded, if they responded at all.

A police involvement was never at the scale we saw on the seventh. I will not idealize the past, but there was real dialogue then about what students need to feel that they belong on campus. There are more recent examples, of course, which people have gone over. Protest is one of the few ways that students get to have a say in their environment, given that they pay to be here. Hundreds of student visits who every semester to work with the

University archives and our other collections, including the DuBois papers. My colleague, Chris Appy, has talked about the Ellsberg papers, which we're very proud to have.

I'm afraid to say all this because I worry about subjecting our work in the archives to scrutiny, especially as I do not personally feel the university cares about my safety as we watch the videos again and again of students violently arrested so often with the library in sight. Students tackled by police on the deck that I walk across every day. I feel sick. Unleashing police on a so-called unlawful assembly robbed students of the idea that they can make change directly outside of the building, where they are invited to find information on whatever they wish. My corpus and I feel unsafe. I've been so sad, knowing what happened outside our doors.

Archives preserve the past and present. We are always thinking about the future. How will this event look to researchers in fifty or a hundred years? There are many of mistruths in the history of UMass Amherst, but the scale of primary sources that will be available to those researchers will be staggering. It will surely **[inaudible]** our legacy. I have no confidence that Chancellor understands or cares about this campus. Remember that this is not new. This has been happening if you've been paying attention. He has arrested in October, and the Administration has done nothing but get in the way of those students' futures. The Chancellor's actions have caused harm that will manifest for years. Again, I will vote no confidence, as I have no confidence in the Chancellor.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Before I go to the next speaker, I would make a couple of announcements. Again, people ask to make sure that people the ballroom speaker actually speaks into the microphone because it's hard for people on Zoom to hear and then also somebody as a point of order noted that the email will come from Anthony Paik, and so some people may not realize who it's coming from when you receive the email to vote. And so that was a on the floor for, and so we'll now go to someone that's standing at the left microphone to speak against the motion. You're recognized to speak.

Jeanne Hardy: Good afternoon. I rise to speak against the motion because this motion is not about Gaza. It is not about religious freedom, it is not about racism, and that has been conflated in the minds of many people. Voting to get rid of our Chancellor is not going to stop the war in Gaza. It is not going to stop racism or sexism or homophobia, but it will throw our campus into turmoil. Just like we've seen in this room today.

When I look at Chancellor Reyes, what I see is a leader who was doing his job. We were told by the people who spoke for this motion that this started on April twenty-ninth. It did not. It started much before that. In February, Chancellor Reyes put together the demonstration response team. He got information from other people. He made a plan. This is what leaders do. Leaders of campuses across this country have been put in an absolutely no-win situation. Sally Kornbluth, my colleague, a **[inaudible]** researcher who is the president of MIT was censured because she didn't stop the protest at MIT. Because Jewish students were harmed.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of order. The speaker is not addressing Presiding Officer Brewer.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I disagree. I believe that these comments are germane to the argument.

Second Unidentified Speaker: She's not addressing- She's addressing the audience.

Senator Olsen: You should look this way.

Jeanne Hardy: Where is the camera? I'm not seeing a camera?

Senator Olsen: Well, just look at the screen.

Jeanne Hardy: Well, the people on that side have been facing the audience.

[Multiple unrecognized audience members speak over one another.]

Jeanne Hardy: This is what leadership looks like to me. Leadership is making a plan. He made a plan. On April 29th, his plan worked. He went to the protesters, he said, 'Take down your encampment', and they complied. On May seventh, he did not say to not protest. He is absolutely in favor of protest, as are most faculty, if not all faculty

on this campus. But he asked them for seven hours to take down their reinforced encampment. If you look at a Daily Collegian newspaper, you will see their report. You can see videotape of the chief of police begging the protest organizers to please just take down the encampment, and they can continue to protest. They refuse. And then everyone who's been talking today is surprised that the police were brought in. Well, there isn't a surprise. They were warned for seven hours. They were surprised that students were pushed down. That's what happens when you're getting arrested. My colleague-

[Multiple unrecognized audience members react to the speaker.]

Jeanne Hardy: Okay I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Maybe- if you're- whatever- You have to assume you'll get your hands cuffed if you're going to get arrested!

Presiding Officer Brewer: You're talking fired, though. Please come to a conclusion.

Jeanne Hardy: Okay, I would like to say in conclusion, that what- I'm sorry because I clearly made a wrong point. But this is our first Latinx Chancellor. We are educators here, and if we want him to act differently, we should educate him, not kick him out.

Unrecognized Speaker: Point of order. She's already past her limit. At this point I'd like to call the question.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I'm sorry we still have people in line to speak. And so I'm going to move now to zoom if someone on zoom is for the motion, please use an emoji or a reaction to show that you're for. If you're against, please make a reaction show you're against. Here's for. Jennie Traschen, you're recognized to speak for the motion.

Jennie Traschen: Thank you. Several people have made the point that we should apply the tools that we teach, right. Universities are about using our basic skills of analyzing a problem, doing research. talking about it, doing more research ,and then talking some more. What to me, the core of this issue, and yes, it does have to do with the UMass community, and it does have to do with the administration of the UMass community. What we're meeting about is not about racism in general or the war in Gaza.

I was just like appalled and shocked that our Chancellor would not use as a model the basic tools of the university. Many of us have been here for a really long time. I've been here for 34 years, and we work hard to teach our students to use the basic tools of investigation and to talk to each other. This is a place for discourse. The- calling in the police, if anybody's been alive in the United States in the last couple of decades, you know what happens when you call in the police on a college campus. And there's plenty of examples in the recent months. Calling in the police only escalates violence and further polarizes the campus, and is so contrary to what a university is about. I don't particularly want a person who doesn't value the core of a university to be one of the leaders. Yeah, I feel unsafe often walking around. Any woman in this country feels unsafe walking around. But that's the way it is, and what our Chancellor does- well, actually let me just close with the following observation in terms of the safety. Calling in the police has not made any of the students who feel unsafe, more safe.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Ken Kleinman, do you have a point of order?

Ken Kleinman: I do have a point of order, Presiding Officer. I don't think that we're required to listen to every opinion. I think that calling the previous question is a legitimate point of order at any time, and that's what the previous point of order was, and I'd like to repeat that.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So we have called the question. We've moved the previous question. For the resolution on no confidence. So this requires a two-thirds vote to close debate. Mr. Secretary, you're prepared to have a motion, a question sent out to close debate on the previous question?

Unidentified Speaker: I have a point of order on that.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order.

Unidentified Speaker: We called the point of order on the first one, because there was nobody on a particular side. I don't remember which one. So conversation on one viewpoint was done. And I think you said when we started that people are still in line, we should not be calling the question. So there aren't many people on a particular side line-

Presiding Officer Brewer: That's correct. What I said was that we would not continue to have points made on the same point over and over again if there wasn't someone on the opposite side. But there's been people on both sides continuously. But now the previous question has been moved to close debate on the resolution on the motion that's on the floor. And so we're going to have a vote to see whether or not the body would like to close debate on this motion. And then we will vote on the motion. So right now we're voting to close debate. So if you-

Secretary Paik: Point of order, Presiding Officer.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary Paik: I think the point that was being made was the alternating rule was not followed. So it was a person who called the question speaking right after someone who had already spoken on the main motion so we did not alternate, is that correct? At least that was my understanding.

Unidentified Speaker: There was only one side left. Here we have a good **[inaudible]**.

Presiding Officer Brewer: My understanding was that we had somebody that made a motion to close debate. And so I had recognized that person. They made a motion to close debate. And so we are currently considering a motion to close debate.

Second Unidentified Speaker: Second.

Ken Kleinman: And it's been seconded. I heard a second from the floor.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes. We're going to move to a vote on whether or not to close debate. This vote will require two-thirds majority to pass, to close debate. If it fails, then we will resume debating the motion.

[Multiple unrecognized audience members begin speaking in the room.]

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary Paik: We'll be ready to send out the next ballot in about a few minutes.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Let us know when you're ready, and then announce to make sure that we understand how it's going to be labeled.

[Multiple unrecognized audience members continue speaking in the room.]

Secretary Paik: We're ready to start a motion to close debate on the main motion.

Presiding Officer Brewer: May I please have order in the room? I can't hear the secretary speak. Mr. Secretary, would you please repeat yourself?

Secretary Paik: Thank you, Presiding Officer. Yes, we are ready to send the ballot to close debate on the main motion. Yes, you are in favour of closing debate, IE calling the question.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. So you should be receiving that question, and you should vote and then we will see whether or not we've reached a two- thirds level. and if we reach a two-thirds level, then we will have a vote on the main motion. If we do not, then we'll have returned to debate, and we will continue to have opposing points of view, alternating points of view.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of order. How can we have a vote if not, everyone has received a ballot?

[Multiple unrecognized audience members begin speaking in the room again.]

Presiding Officer Brewer: While voting is taking place, I see several people have hands raised on Zoom. I'm going to ask them if they have a point of order. Yuriy Brun, do you have a point of order?

Yuriy Brun: Yes, I have a point of order. I object to our voting when numerous members of our faculty cannot vote. We know we're not allowing a set of people to vote, and we're just plowing along as if everything is fine. Are we serious? We cannot continue like this. We are literally voting on having a no confidence in something, using a voting process in which we have no confidence ourselves. I don't want us to be a laughingstock as a result of this process. We have to suspend this meeting and fix the voting issue.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Roberto Alejandro, you're recognized to speak.

Roberto Alejandro: No, I don't have any point of order, and I just want to talk about in support of the motion, if by any chance the conversation continues.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Hossein Kazemi, you're recognized.

Hossein Kazemi: This is a joke. I have not received anything. I have not voted on anything. How could this be going on? This is totally unfair. This is not legal. This is not consistent with our values to just have some people who are there vote, and some people don't vote. I've been sitting here for three hours!

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you.

Hossein Kazemi: This is ridiculous!

Presiding Officer Brewer: Cassie Spracklen, you recognized to speak.

Cassie Spracklen: I just wanna say that I have also been on this meeting for almost four hours . And I have yet to receive a single email asking for any votes or the test and I've checked junk mail and all of those things. Unable to vote all day, and it's not quite fair, in my opinion, either.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Rodrigo Zamith, you're recognized to speak.

Rodrigo Zamith: Sure. So just a point of order. If people are concerned with their ability to vote, might it be simpler to move away from Qualtrics and simply use a Google form that has a sign in requirement which requires you to be authenticated? It limits them to one vote. And we can just screen share a short link. So that way, we don't have to rely on email. It seems like that's a much simpler way of doing things that would ensure everybody has the ability to vote if they're able to type in the URL.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Patrick Mason, do you have a point of order?

Patrick L. Mason: Yes, I just noticed that I got an email saying I was registered manually. However, I don't have anything allowing me to vote.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Sally Linowski, you're recognize to speak.

Sally Linowski: Hello, I, too, have been unable to vote. And I did get an email from project assistant saying I'm registered, and I should have a link, to look in my junk mail. I've been looking in my junk and my inbox for three and a half hours, and I feel that this process is unfair, and flawed.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Audrey Altstadt, you recognize to speak.

Audrey Altstadt: Thank you. Point of information. I found my emails in my deleted box. They came in already deleted. And that was how I found that so that might help people to find the email.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Liz Delia. You recognize to speak.

Liz Delia: Hi, yes, I have received the emails, but several of my coworkers have not. So that just stands with what everybody else said. But also since this meeting started, four and a half hours ago, it looks like at least on the zoom over 100 people have left, so that gives us less confidence with the vote.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Mr. Secretary, may I ask for a status update?

Secretary Paik: Thank you, Presiding Officer. We have received 640 votes, and I'm expecting some more, I sent out about 990.

Erica Scharrer: Point of order in the room please.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Order.

Erica Scharrer: May I suggest that we find a different means of making sure that people who cannot vote do get to weigh in maybe a five-minute recess. What we do not wanna do is recess the whole meeting at this point. Instead of just, you know, noting that some people can't vote, can we jot their names down, please, and reach out to them and make sure they can vote.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you for this point. My understanding is that all of these people have emailed Project Assistant, perhaps more than once at this point. And it may be that there are some other problems that are resulting in it, like they're showing up in their deleted email and or someplace that they haven't been able to look. I have also received a point of order that we're coming up rapidly at 5 o'clock, and for a lot of people that have childcare duties or other duties, we're going to be losing people that will be unable to participate in the process and I'll call again on the secretary for a status update.

Secretary Paik: The book count is still stable at 640 votes, so I request that we call it.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order.

Unidentified Speaker: I have a suggestion because you have counted hands for people who do not receive votes on Zoom, it was around 30. There were some in the room. That is not a lot of people. Can those people email their vote so that we do recognize their vote? That's a very quick process.

Presiding Officer Brewer: You have been unable to vote, if you've not received a vote, please send an email to Project Assistant with the content of your vote.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of order.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order.

Unidentified Speaker: The interpretation of the 300 plus people who whose balance were not received, that they chose not to vote, but that they were unable to vote or some combination. Procedurally it matters with respect to how to ensure how to vote on the motion.

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Paik: I think there are weird reasons why there's technical glitches here. I mean, part of it is some emails that we've gotten are incorrect. Some people submitted just their login, you know, without the "@umass.edu". Some people have submitted capitalized emails **[Inaudible]**. We've had some issues but we are steadily increasing **[Inaudible]** more votes each time, but from my standpoint, if you're there and you are ready to vote, and you submitted information correctly, and you are getting it, and there's a glitch **[Inaudible]** you know just the reality of the situation. Hybrid with technical glitches and small little things like, you know, your email wasn't the correct email address or properly formatted.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of order, more information.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of order.

Unidentified Speaker: Can I make a motion to adjourn-

[Multiple unrecognized speakers from the room disagree with the speaker.]

Presiding Officer Brewer: Let me, as the presiding officer, make a suggestion, which I think may address some of the concerns that we have. So it sounds to me like we've had a very rich discussion of the issues from both sides, and I know that there are many people that would have liked to have spoken that did not yet get a chance to speak. But we are running very, very late. There's also been a number of concerns that the voting that is happening in real time is not working. So let me simply put it to the body, a suggestion that I have. I suggest that we send out a Qualtrics, link to all of the faculty, and leave that open for some period of time in terms of the resolution. We had the discussion of the resolution we considered amending it, we decided to not amend it. And we've now closed debate, we think, on the motion, and so I think we should simply have a vote on the motion, but not try and have that vote in real time. Let's give everyone an opportunity to register their vote of the whole faculty with a Qualtrics link that will run for a more extended period of time, and then we can see what that result is. So that's my recommendation for what to do at this point. And it's the best that I have given what we've got.

Unidentified Speaker: I object to this motion. I don't know how to do that correctly, please inform me. We've been sitting here, hearing debate, those at home have not. I think the whole point of having this meeting was to get the other side's argument out, to hear people speak, and if you didn't hear those people speak, I think you forfeit your ability to vote on this topic.

[Multiple audience members sound agreements with the speaker.]

Presiding Officer Brewer: So my suggestion has been rejected. And so then we're left with-

Second Unidentified Speaker: Point of order. One person can't reject a vote of information.

Presiding Officer Brewer: My suggestion was essentially from the standpoint of without objection I was proposing a course of action, and since that course of action has been objected to that we can't simply pursue that course of action. And at this point, then, since I'm not really eligible to make motions, someone else is going to have to make a motion. But what we're at right now in terms of the voting that we are currently doing is whether or not to close debate. And, Mr. Secretary, are you prepared to say that we should close debate based on the vote that you have?

Secretary Paik: Yes, Presiding Officer.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So what were the numbers of the vote? Just so that we know.

Secretary Paik: Thank you, Presiding Officer. We have 561 yeses, 80 nos, and 8 absentions.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So that's well, well, beyond two-thirds and represents, I think, an overwhelming recognition that we should end debate at this point. And so now the question is in terms of a vote. And, Mr. Secretary, do you feel comfortable moving forward with a vote on the main motion at this time?

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer, I'll need five minutes to get the next vote ready, but I feel comfortable.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Very good. So I see a number of people that have raised their hands. What I would like to ask you to do is if you've not been able to vote, and you've got your hand raised because you've not received a ballot, that what you should do is you should simply email Project Assistant with the contents of your vote on the main motion. And you can do so at this time. Simply indicate clearly that you're voting yes, to vote no confidence, or you're voting no, to not vote no confidence in the Chancellor, and to go ahead and send that email now.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of information.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of information.

Unidentified Speaker: I speak publicly and gracefully to say, for your **[inaudible]** sake, that, for example, Northampton has you know, 21,000 folks who live there, and they have like tabulation machines to help facilitate that process. So it seems like they're doing the best they can with such a large amount of voters spread across different bodies. And so my point of information is out of compassion for people who are operating this process for us.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So I see a number of people with hands raised on zoom, and while we're waiting for the question to go out, I'm going to go through those and ask them if they have a point of information that is not about whether or not they're able to vote, because we've resolved that issue in that they are now to email their vote. And so, if you still have some separate point of information unrelated to that, I'll call on people. Alasdair Roberts, you're recognized.

Alasdair Roberts: I'd just like to raise a question about the fairness and legitimacy of this process. The question is not just whether we're able to vote in this final vote. I've been sitting here since one o'clock. I've been unable to vote consistently on proceeding votes building up to this vote. The process has been unfair. And it raises questions about the legitimacy of the result. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Sara Mamo. You're recognized to speak.

Sara Mamo: Yeah, I have gotten all the emails and been able to vote, except for now,I can't vote because I'm literally gonna miss pick up, and I'm walking while I'm listening, and I can't manage it. So is there a time window for sending that email to Project Assistant? Cause I can't do it right now.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Let me do it for you.

Sara Mamo: How? You want me to publicly for the room, and everyone?

Presiding Officer Brewer: There is that. That's a good question. I guess is there a way for you to tell me what the substance of your vote is.

Sara Mamo: I don't really know how to manage this right here.

Senator Olsen: Mr. Presiding Officer?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Olsen?

Senator Olsen: Yes, I hope we misunderstood what you were saying, you cannot vote on her behalf. That would be a proxy vote.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Okay, yeah, I was simply gonna try and record it. But you're right, I am unable to do that. Jonathan Skolnik, you're recognized.

Jonathan Skolnik: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. A point of information is, I was in line to speak to the motion, and was going to raise a motion to substitute. What's the status of my request? And do I keep my hand up?

Presiding Officer Brewer: I believe, that we are currently voting on the motion right now. So such a motion is no longer in order. Jessica Pearlman, you recognize to speak.

Jessica Pearlman: Yeah. I was wondering if we could vote on your suggestion. Basically, can I propose that, you know? Your suggestion?

Presiding Officer Brewer: We're voting on the main motion, and so-

Jessica Pearlman: No, no, I know, but it was like you raised that, and then someone said no, and then it sort of was brushed away. Do you know what I'm saying?

Presiding Officer Brewer: It's because I'm not really allowed to make motions.

Jessica Pearlman: So that I know. So I'm trying to make that motion for you. Given how many concerns there are, you know, about the voting and stuff.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you, but I'm gonna move on to the next person. Brian Ogilvie, do you have a point of order?

Brian Ogilvie: Yes, I do have a point of order in response to your suggestion earlier, Mr. Presiding officer. I understand the objection that people who are not at the meeting shouldn't vote. But the registration software has a list of everyone's email who registered to vote already. So could the vote be confirmed only to those people in a more leisurely fashion that would allow everyone to resolve any technical problems, rather than have people feel as if they were unfairly excluded from the process? Just a suggestion for a consideration.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. And then, let's see, Jessica Perlman, do you have a point of order?

Jessica Pearlman: No, no, no! I already spoke, sorry.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Laurie Salame?

Laurie Salame: So two things. One is, I kind of agree with what he just said with, you know everybody who was here, conceivably people when they came in to the building physically had to sign in. So you could all send us an email to all of us and have us vote. The other alternative is, and I understand that people who weren't here didn't get to hear the benefit of everybody's arguments, but if we did send it to all faculty and let them vote, we could give them a transcript of those discussions.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Jill Fitzsimmons, you're recognized to speak. Jill?

Unidentified Speaker: Mr. Presiding Officer? I would like to move that we suspend the rules to reopen discussion of the suggestion you provided and give time for a motion on that.

Presiding Officer Brewer: We are currently in the middle of a vote, as I understand it, and so such a motion is not in order. We need to conclude this particular vote before we can have a motion to suspend the rules, and then a motion to suspend the rules requires a two-thirds vote in order for that to be accomplished. Mr. Secretary, may I have a status update, please?

Secretary Paik: Thank you, Presiding Officer, for asking the question. I'm about one or two minutes from having the new list that includes everybody. And again, my apologies to everyone that’s had a frustrating afternoon given the technical difficulties. So my deepest apologies, and I also want to thank the team over there that is working really hard to serve everybody here, and on that note our inability to get all the votes is devastating, personally. So I apologize. But I think we'll be right about a minute or two with the largest list ever. So just give me a moment.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Katherine Reeves, you recognize to speak.

Katherine Reeves: Yes, thank you. Point of order. I'm wondering what processes are in place to ensure that people are not voting multiple times. It seems that the point of the Qualtrics survey was to prevent that. But now you're asking people to also email Project Assistant and there's no way to verify if they also did not vote via Qualtrics.

Presiding Officer Brewer: My understanding is that via Qualtrics you can see who's voted. And so, therefore we can eliminate duplicate votes that way. Lisa Lehmberg, you're recognized to speak.

Lisa Lehmberg: Thank you. I'd just like to point out that for the faculty who have not received invitations to vote, that emailing your vote in with your name attached to your vote may make some people feel vulnerable like, pre-tenure your faculty, or you know other situations as well. And so, I just wanted to mention that because I'm sure that's a fair way to treat everyone. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Karen Giuliano, you are recognized to speak.

Karen Giuliano: Could you repeat the full email address for Project Assistant?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, it's projectasst@umass.edu.

Karen Giuliano: Okay, thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Let me put it on the screen again. Is that visible to you?

[Members of the audience confirm that it is visible.]

Unidentified Speaker: Point of information.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of information.

Unidentified Speaker: Project Assistant is not a faculty member or librarian, and this person can immediately delete all emails. So I don't think this person should be framed as someone who could hurt anyone.

Second Unidentified Speaker: Can I make a point of information, please?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of information.

Second Unidentified Speaker: Just a quick question again on this vote. What the time window is from which the vote will be open? And I simply ask because I know colleagues-

[The speaker is interrupted by noise from the room]

Presiding Officer Brewer: May I have order in the room, please. I can't hear the speaker while-

Second Unidentified Speaker: People have to leave, and people have already left that are interested in this matter, and I'm just curious. Are they eligible to vote online? If so, what is the time window for the valid votes on this motion? Is it 5 minutes, or is it four hours? I think it's important to clarify because people who are interest in this, and who registered, who have been present but had to leave quite recently. They still have an interest in voting, and, as I understand it, based on what we've been discussing, they would be eligible to vote on this motion. So I just wanna understand what the ruling is on who's eligible to vote, and what the time window for that is. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary, would you care to respond to that?

Secretary Paik: I believe we should conduct maybe a 10-minute vote, as we have been doing so far, and-

[The Secretary is interrupted by noise from the room]

Presiding Officer Brewer: People on zoom are unable to hear, because there are people in the room that are speaking. Mr. Secretary, may I ask you to repeat what you said, because those of us on Zoom were unable to hear.

Secretary Paik: We are ready to conduct votes, and we should continue to follow our practices on how long we leave the vote open.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So how long do you propose to leave the vote open, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Paik: Like 10 minutes, maybe.

Presiding Officer Brewer: 10 minutes. Very good. Send the vote when you're ready.

Secretary Paik: Email Caitlyn Foster, projectasst@umass.edu, to submit an alternate ballot.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I'm gonna recognize people that have not yet made a point of order. Marla Miller, you are recognized to speak.

Marla Miller: Thank you. I just wanna add my voice to those who are concerned about the integrity of this vote. I'm among the people who have not had an ability to vote all afternoon, and this process has been highly irregular throughout. And so I'm concerned about what people will make of these numbers or do with these numbers, and I'm not at all sure what they represent to have votes coming in through different media at different times and formats. I support your suggestion for a Qualtrics that goes to everybody at once, and there's one set of votes. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of information.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of information.

Unidentified Speaker: Could we clarify that even if we have a number of people who cannot vote in these 10 minutes, that with the votes that do come in, since we're going for a simple majority, so if there were 1000 people originally signed up through the Qualtrics, if we get over half of that, even if we miss some, it doesn't matter, and it's not a matter. It's- I wanna make clear that if that happens it's not an unfair vote. The mathematics works, we're over 50% we should call it. So I just wanna clarify that, thank you.

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer, may I answer that question?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary, you're recognized to speak.

Secretary Paik: Thank you for the question. So under our rules, people that vote are those that attend the meeting. So at the end of meetings if people have left the meeting they do not have the right to vote. So that is how we run them, that’s why those who are present to vote will cast now, there’s no opportunity for those who have left to vote here.

Presiding Officer Brewer: So, Mr. Secretary, have you sent the vote?

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer. I've sent the vote. We sent it to 1026 emails. 683 surveys were started. Looks like, we have one or two emails that failed.

Presiding Officer Brewer: And at what time did you send it?

Secretary Paik: Sorry Presiding Officer, what was the question?

Presiding Officer Brewer: I was simply asking, at what time did you send it? If we're going to have it open for 10 minutes.

Secretary Paik: I sent it at 5:02.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Brian Cheng, you're recognized to speak.

Brian Cheng: Thank you, Presiding Officer. I just want to be crystal clear about the language of the vote. Can you please restate what a yes and no vote means. I know that others have the same question. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Brewer: On the screen you should see the resolution that's before you. If you vote yes, you are voting to adopt this resolution, and to vote no confidence in Chancellor Raise. If you vote no, you are voting to reject this resolution. Patrick Mason, you are recognized to speak.

Patrick L. Mason: I finally received a link to vote, so success!

Presiding Officer Brewer: Alright. Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Point of information.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Point of information.

Unidentified Speaker: I wanted to just get clarification on the question of a quorum. And the quorum is based on the number of Qualtrics emails that were sent out, and what that number that we're looking for to constitute a quorum-

[Speaker is interrupted by noise from the audience.]

Presiding Officer Brewer: Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Paik: Thank you, Presiding Officer. So, under the Senate rules a quorum is determined by those attending the meeting.

Unidentified Speaker: Can I get clarification on that clarification? So 1000 people are present, a quorum is a thousand people? So if you sent out 1000 emails-

Secretary Paik: So to clarify I'm sending emails to all those-

Unidentified Speaker: That's a percentage that has to-

[Inaudible discussion from the audience.]

Presiding Officer Brewer: Claudia Wilson, you're recognized to speak.

Claudia Wilson: Hi, I'm confused with the order and everything. I'm new to this, so I'm sorry if I'm not doing it properly. I'm referring to the question that was made earlier about the language, and that language wasn't clear to me, and I don't think I voted the way I wanted to because of that. What should I do?

Presiding Officer Brewer: I'm afraid that if you voted that that your vote will be registered the way you voted.

Claudia Wilson: Okay.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. Irene Dujovne, you're recognized to speak.

Irene Dujovne: Yes, I want to request that this stays longer open. This time is exactly a pickup time for kids, so some people might not be able to answer the email on time. The other issue is regarding the quorum. And I received the message twice, because I have two email addresses. So how is this- I only voted once, of course. But how is this taking into account for people that have 3 email addresses?

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you. That's a question for the secretary.

Secretary Paik: Thank you, Presiding Officer, for the question. If a faculty member gave us multiple email addresses, they will receive multiple links. I trust they only voted once.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Hossein Kazemi, you are recognized to speak.

Hossein Kazemi: Is the vote by email acceptable, because I have not received anything except one email about an hour ago.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Yes, an email is acceptable.

Hossein Kazemi: Okay.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Thank you.

Secretary Paik: Presiding Officer, with the exception of the last few emails, I believe we have a final vote.

Presiding Officer Brewer: I'm sorry, can you repeat that I was unable to hear you.

Secretary Paik: We're just waiting for a tabulation of the votes submitted by email, but I believe we have the final vote. Presiding Officer, I believe we have the final numbers.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Would you please read the numbers to me?

Secretary Paik: In terms of yeses, we have 473. For nos we have 332. And 20 absentions.

Presiding Officer Brewer: That means that Motion 01-024 has been adopted by this body of the General Faculty meeting. We have reached the end of the agenda. I'm going to declare the meeting adjourned. Thank you very much for attending.

Respectfully Submitted,
Anthony Paik, Secretary